

BATTLE OF THE BIBLES

H. H. MEYERS



BATTLE OF THE BIBLES

H. H. MEYERS

Battle of the Bibles is not just "another of those books on the Bible versions". On the contrary, it is an absorbing documentary about scheming, intrigue and fraud as practiced by a Super Power in it's battle for total spiritual and political domination.

Prominent among the weapons employed in this continuing war are the Interconfessional Bibles. The arsenal which produces them is known as Ecumenism.

Those who have read the author's documentary on the Goa Inquisition – "The Inquisitive Christians" – will anticipate with relish the reading of this book.

Battle Of The Bibles

H.H. Meyers

author of

With Cloak and Dagger

The Inquisitive Christians

A Matter of Pedigree

Copyright © 1993 H.H. Meyers.

ISBN 0 646 16475 9

Published by
New Millennium Publications
Post Box 290,
Morisset. NSW. 2264. Australia.

Printed and bound in Australia
by The Book Printer, Victoria

Table of Contents

<i>By way of introduction</i>	5
Section One - The Protestant Reformation	7
1. <i>Pre-Reformation Years</i>	8
2. <i>Colet and Erasmus</i>	15
3. <i>Tyndale the Brave</i>	25
4. <i>Protestantism's Early Struggle to Survive</i>	30
5. <i>The Reformation Prospers</i>	37
6. <i>The Council of Trent</i>	40
7. <i>The Spanish Contender</i>	46
8. <i>Battle of the Bibles</i>	49
9. <i>Invasion Preparations</i>	52
10. <i>The Armada Sails</i>	57
11. <i>King James the Protestant</i>	61
Section Two - "My Words Shall Not Pass Away"	67
12. <i>Seeds of Apostasy</i>	68
13. <i>Early Christian Missionaries</i>	74
14. <i>Dividers of the Faith</i>	77
15. <i>Keepers of the Faith</i>	81
Section Three - War on the King James Bible	88
16. <i>Higher Criticism - Enemy of the Reformation</i>	89
17. <i>Kindly Light or Searing Flame?</i>	93
18. <i>The Schemers</i>	104
19. <i>The Fraud Exposed</i>	111
20. <i>The Mercersburg Movement</i>	116
21. <i>The Bible Societies</i>	120
22. <i>A Twentieth-Century Burgon</i>	126
23. <i>The Romanising of the Bible Societies</i>	132
24. <i>Interconfessional Bibles and Ecumenism</i>	137

Table of Contents Continued

Section Four - The Ecumenical Trap	142
<i>25. Unheeded Warnings</i>	143
<i>26. Rome's Little Helper</i>	154
<i>27. Fruits of AntiChrist</i>	164
<i>28. Conclusion</i>	190
 <i>General Index</i>	 197
<i>Chronological Index</i>	202
<i>Trinitarian Bible Society</i>	204
<i>Inquisitive Christians</i>	206

By way of introduction

For well over three centuries, when English-speaking people spoke of the Bible, it was accepted that they were referring to the Authorised of King James I. Its appearance in 1611 was the culmination of a century of diligent toil on the part of the Reformers who were prepared to place their lives at risk in order that the common people might have access to the Word of God. In the process, there emerged the Protestant Reformation which quickly dispelled the spiritual and intellectual gloom of the Dark Ages.

By the mid-twentieth century, while adjusting to the changing values of the newly arrived atomic era, English-speaking Protestants were subjected to a strange phenomenon. Gradually, they were becoming accustomed to their pastors referring to curious renditions of Bible texts. At first, the version from which they were reading was always identified and used only as an aid to amplifying the sense of their beloved King James Bible.

After a while, some of the more daring preachers were beginning to show a decided preference for modern versions by using them in place of the King James Version. Young people were told that the archaic language of their old Bible was beyond their comprehension. It was suggested to their parents that Bibles needed to be constantly tuned to modern-day relevance.

Soon, many preachers ceased to identify the version from which they read. The Bible of the Reformation had been replaced! But replaced with what?

With a plethora of modern Bibles now being offered by

numerous Bible houses, many sincere Christians are in a quandary as to which Bible best projects God's will for man. Then, after having selected a new Bible, it is not long before they are told that a better one has arrived. Confusion, and lack of confidence in changing and sometimes conflicting Scriptures, is the inevitable result.

The purpose of this book is to simply demonstrate that, fundamentally and historically, there are only two differing Bibles and that their New Testaments issue from two basic streams of manuscripts. One, reflecting God's will for man, has been guarded and handed down to us by the Apostolic Churches; the other, has been polluted by a super power which has used its corrupt Bibles in a relentless effort to achieve global domination through total spiritual and political control.

When this fact is grasped, the reader will have no difficulty discerning on which side a particular version stands in relation to this long-running Battle of the Bibles.

In pursuit of this goal the author has divided this work into four sections. Each deals with a particular time period and each is a topic largely complete in itself.

It is the author's fervent wish that the reader's faith in God's revelation of His will for man will be established or confirmed, and that any doubts or reservations as to which version most faithfully transmits that revelation will be irreversibly dispelled.

H. H. Meyers
November 1993.

Section One

Chapters One to Eleven

The Protestant Reformation

"In the sixteenth century, the Reformation, presenting an open Bible to the people, had sought admission to all the countries of Europe. Some nations welcomed it with gladness, as a messenger of Heaven. In other lands the papacy succeeded to a great extent in preventing its entrance".

"The war against the Bible, carried forward for so many centuries in France, culminated in the scenes of the Revolution. That terrible outbreaking was but the legitimate result of Rome's suppression of the Scriptures. It represented the most striking illustration which the world has ever witnessed of the working out of papal policy" (E.G. White, "The Great Controversy", p 265).

Chapter One

Pre-Reformation Years

When the people of England went to church in the early sixteenth century, they did so with a sense of obligation tinged with awe and even fear, for attendance at Mass in the parish church was seen as a ritual essential to the preservation of body and soul.

In those days their priests were seldom heard reading from the Bible; it was written in Latin. What they did hear and understand were the prayers for an Italian prince of the Medici nobility who was known to them as Pope Clement. The pope was virtually the indisputable ruler of Europe in temporal as well as spiritual matters. Believing him to be a successor of the apostle Peter, and, therefore custodian of the heavenly keys, the English were not only inclined to render him spiritual allegiance, but were bound by ecclesiastical and civil laws to pay taxes for his support.

One of the annual taxes levied on every household was cunningly designed to reinforce the dogma of apostolic succession. It was called, "Peter's Pence". When first introduced it was a mere "penny per hearth", but like other schemes for collecting tax, it soon demonstrated its propensity to increase as well as to proliferate.

The pope's tax agents were considered as set apart and above the mundane affairs of life. They were not subject to civil laws, but if the occasion demanded it, they were tried before an ecclesiastical court. They carried impressive titles such as Archbishop, Archdeacon and Parish Priest.

To assist the pope's men in their holy endeavours, lay men and women were appointed as church wardens. Besides being responsible for the upkeep and care of the church and its surrounds, they were expected to keep Peter's Pennies rolling

in. They also had to collect other of the numerous taxes among which were levies consisting of tithes, mortuary dues and probate fees. (See D.H. Pill, *"The English Reformation"*, pp 22, 25)

And then there were the Mendicant Friars who literally swarmed over the countryside like a plague, begging and sometimes demanding food, lodging and money.

For the pious faithful, the church had much to offer, but it was nearly all collectable in a future life. If this was insufficient inducement for the faithless, there was the ever present spectre of an intermediate stay in purgatory and even everlasting hell-fire. But for those who openly questioned the credibility of the system, their passage to hell was given a decided impetus with the designation of the term, "heretic". In the year 1519, seven "heretics" from Coventry and Birmingham were burned and consigned to hell.

It seems that these unfortunate victims of ecclesiastical judgment imbibed Lollard-like beliefs. The Lollards had arrived at "wicked" and "dangerous" conclusions as a result of reading Wycliffe's English translation of the Bible. They no longer believed such Roman Catholic dogmas as transubstantiation and infant baptism.

John Wycliffe was born in Yorkshire in 1324. Like many ambitious young men of his era, he had pursued theological studies at Oxford with a view to following a political career. This may seem strange to us today. However, back then the church had a monopoly on education. It was what came to be known as Rome's scholastic system. The language of Rome was Latin. Therefore, as Rome controlled the colleges and universities, the learned men of Europe spoke and wrote in Latin. Such men were regarded by the pope as subjects of his ecclesiastical empire. Under this strange system, civil servants could become bishops and bishops could become highly-placed civil servants. There were men ordained as priests who had never seen, let alone read the Bible!

When Wycliffe was only twenty-four he witnessed a terrible calamity. The people of England were struck down by a plague

known as the, "Black Death". Coming from Asia and through Europe, it left a trail of death and misery which effectively halved both Europe and England's populations.

To the youthful Wycliffe

"This visitation of the Almighty sounded like the trumpet of the judgment-day... Alarmed at the thoughts of eternity, the young man... passed days and nights in his cell groaning and sighing, and calling on God to show him the path he ought to follow" (D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation", Book XVII chapter VII).

Turning to the Scriptures (for by this time, Wycliffe was an accomplished Latin scholar), he found solace and inspiration, and he developed a determination to make them his rule and guide in life. He longed to see the Bible not only re-established as the authority of the church, but to make it available in the language of the people.

Soon he was writing and preaching condemnation of the excesses of his church, and in particular the pope's lately-assumed sovereignty over the English crown. As a result, Wycliffe won the patronage of King Edward III who appointed him as one of his chaplains. Thus, when Wycliffe inevitably drew upon himself the wrath of the papacy, he was able to enjoy the King's protection.

Little by little Wycliffe's priorities were changing. Caring less about the temporal kingdom, he devoted more time to Christ's Eternal Kingdom. As he studied the Bible, he came to expose the absurdities which he perceived to be part of the Roman Catholic ritual. He longed to replace in the minds of his people the mysteries of the Mass and Transubstantiation with the "mystery of Godliness".

As Wycliffe's reputation in the universities increased, he was able to inculcate in the minds of his students the authority of God's Word as opposed to the assumed authority of the Catholic Church and its priests.

His obvious sincerity and love of the gospel soon imbued his students with a desire to take the Bible and tell from it the story

of Christ's way of salvation which does not depend on works. There was much poverty and ignorance in those days and people were still suffering from the devastating effects of the Black Death. To those of whom Christ said: *"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"* (Matthew 5:3), the gospel of love contrasted pleasantly with the cajoling and threats of the pretentious, pleasure-loving friars. As in the days of Christ, the common people received Wycliffe's unpretentious priests gladly. The scholasticism of Rome with its penchant for allegorising away the Scriptures began to be replaced with faith in Jesus Christ as the one and only Saviour and Mediator between man and God (1 Timothy 2:5, 6).

Wycliffe's intense interest in expounding the Scriptures eventually led him to take the prestigious degree of Doctor of Divinity. He now felt competent to undertake the ambitious and unheard of task of making the Bible available to all by translating it into English. Being highly skilled in Latin, he set about translating the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate Bible. He worked on the New Testament for over ten years, completing it in 1380. At once an enthusiastic bank of copyists set about the task of hand-copying hundreds of Bibles which were soon eagerly received by the lower and upper-class alike.

This was too much for the authoritarian Church of Rome. The last thing the papacy wanted was to have the people being led by the Holy Spirit to an understanding of Bible truths. Successive attempts to stifle Wycliffe and his work were thwarted by those who had seen the light of reform. But the great strain on the pioneer Reformer gradually took its toll. At the age of sixty, Dr. John Wycliffe succumbed to a stroke. He was not to know that future events would confer on him the illustrious title: "The Morning Star of the Reformation". Mercifully, he did not witness the terrible persecutions to which his countrymen would be subjected, nor the intense anger of Rome which would seek to expiate its wrath by committing the sacrilege of digging up his bones for public burning thirty years after his death!

As the missionary work of the Lollards continued expanding

after Wycliffe's death, it seemed that the reform of the Catholic Church in England was imminent. But sinister Counter-Reformation forces were at work. What the church could not do by persuasion, it would seek to carry out by using the powers of the state. In 1390 a motion was made in the Upper House of Parliament to have all copies of Wycliffe's Bible seized.

But the Duke of Lancaster indignantly exclaimed,

"Are we then the very dregs of humanity, that we cannot possess the laws of our religion in our own language?" (ibid Chapter VIII).

Rome does not give in easily. By the dawn of the fifteenth century, the Primate of the Catholic Church, Archbishop Arundel, connived with the new King, Henry IV for papal support in return for the outlawing of the Lollards. In no time, a pious priest who refused adoration of the cross, became the first of a long list of English martyrs. William Sowtree was his name. He was burnt alive at Smithfield in 1401.

The famous French chronicler of the Reformation, H.J. Merle D'Aubigne, D.D., gives us an inkling of the hatred exhibited by the papacy against the Bible:

"Encouraged by this act of faith - this auto da fe - the clergy drew up articles known as the 'Constitution of Arundel', which forbade the reading of the Bible, and styled the pope, 'Not a mere man, but a true God'" (ibid Chapter IX).

But even as Wycliffe's ashes were cast into the River Swift at Lutterworth, to flow eventually into the bosom of the restless sea, so his seeds of reform were to reach out far from the shores of England, eventually to rock Roman Catholicism to its very foundations.

But the time was not yet. God's divine programme was yet to be revealed. Vital to the success of His plan was the restoration of His Word in unadulterated form. Wycliffe's Bible, a bold translation of Rome's Latin Vulgate, was in effect an English version of Jerome's fourth-century Bible. This was a different

Bible from that used by people like the Waldenses and Albigenses who had received and guarded their scriptures from apostolic times. As Rome hunted down these faithful Christians, she destroyed their Bibles, a knowledge of which was virtually forgotten by the time of Wycliffe.

Then there were the Bibles of the Eastern Churches that had early found their way from Antioch into Persia, Armenia, India and even China. But during the long period of the Dark Ages they, along with Greek and Eastern literature, had been sealed off from the West by Rome's occupation of the strategic gateway to Asia at Constantinople. With Rome's universal use of the Latin language, knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages had largely been lost. But in accordance with God's plan a change was to come, and it struck like an "eastwind" as the Turks invaded Constantinople. The hordes of Mahomet advanced westward driving before them all who sought refuge. Within five years, Athens had fallen.

Among the refugees were numerous of the intellectual classes who fled to Italy, many of whom were Hebrew and Greek scholars. With them they brought their literature. It was as if darkened Italy had suddenly received a great burst of light and under its glare, Roman Catholicism was doomed to suffer. The church, and religion generally, came under question as Catholic priests and scholars turned to the study of Hebrew and Greek in order to devour the newly-obtained classical literature. Along with this literature came the Byzantine Scriptures and Greek manuscripts from which they were derived.

Now the scholars of the Western World began to realise the extent to which they had been deprived of culture and learning occasioned by the stultifying scholastic system of the ecclesia.

Shortly prior to the Turkish-driven flight of learning, there occurred an epoch-making event in the small German town of Mainz. There the process of printing was discovered in 1440 by Johannes Gutenberg. The subsequent growth of printing techniques paralleled the growth of the Renaissance, thus providing a vehicle for the spread of that learning. It was no coincidence then that the new learning rapidly forged ahead in

Germany. D'Aubigne draws a very interesting comparison of the effects which the ancient literature had on Italy and Germany:

"What had produced in Italian minds a minute and barren refinement of the understanding, pervaded the whole being of the Germans, warmed their hearts and prepared them for a brighter light... In the one country the foundations of the Church were undermined; in the other they were re-established on their true basis" (D'Aubigne's **"History of the Reformation"**, Book 1, Chapter VII).

Near the close of the fifteenth century, a luminary named John Reuchlin appeared on the German horizon. By the youthful age of twenty, he was teaching philosophy, Greek and Latin at Basle. His later interest in the study of Hebrew resulted in his being the first to publish in Germany a Hebrew grammar and dictionary. His deep interest in things spiritual led him to study Hebrew with a view to converting the numerous Israelites to the gospel of Christ. As a result, he brought out a Hebrew Old Testament free from the appalling corruptions then prevailing. In so doing, he did not hesitate to depart in places from the corruptions of the Latin Vulgate (*ibid*).

Such "blasphemy" inevitably brought this daring man into disfavour with the Romish establishment, drawing the particular ire of the Dominicans, which honourable order of priests Pope Gregory IX in 1233 had entrusted with conducting the papal Inquisitions. But their evil designs on Reuchlin were thwarted by Pope Leo X. With such lack of papal support, the Dominicans had good reason for alarm; they were witnessing the preparatory phase of the great Protestant Reformation!

The first of the two Great Witnesses on which Protestantism was to be built had been set in place. The next would be the New Testament.

Chapter Two

Colet and Erasmus

Desiderius Erasmus of Holland was twelve years Reuchlin's junior. He was born in 1467 of parents who had neglected the formality of wedlock; yet this did not deter them from naming their son, "Gerard", meaning in Dutch, "The Beloved".

The young Gerard early showed all the classic signs of genius. His fascination and aptitude for learning languages were soon put to practical use. He sought out the Greek equivalent of his name and promptly renamed himself "Erasmus". To this he prefixed the Latin equivalent "Desiderius"; hence a name was coined which would within his lifetime, attract to itself a lustre rarely duplicated in any one generation. Acclaimed as "the great genius of the age", he was destined to do for the New Testament what Reuchlin had done for the Old.

Although unlike his younger contemporary, Martin Luther who was born in 1483, it would not be to the credit of the Reformers to designate Erasmus as such. Yet his life and work were indispensable to the development of the Reformation.

As was the custom of his time, Erasmus received a monastic education, but this experience only served to alert him to the folly of the prevailing scholasticism and the malpractices of the church. He was to spend much of his early career sharpening his wit and literary skills in satirising the vices practised by the clerics.

In so doing, he was only confirming the developing anti-sacerdotal tendency of the age, a condition which the church blamed upon the revival of learning brought about by classical scholars whom it was pleased to brand as "humanists". In many

cases this was true, especially as we have noted of the Italian scholars.

But in England and Germany the scholarship of the theologians had been tempered by the now widespread teachings of Wycliffe and his followers, a circumstance not readily available to the Italians by virtue of their proximity to Rome. Then there was an almost constant stream of rottenness issuing forth from the Holy See, the effects of which conditioned the minds of thinking Italians to embrace a humanistic philosophy. Perhaps it was the divine hand of Providence that prevented Erasmus's monastic training from confirming him in such a course through his meeting with John Colet.

John Colet, son of a London Lord Mayor, was naturally of a religious temperament. Having spent some time as a student at Oxford, he went to Rome to further his ecclesiastical education. There he was imbued with the spirit of the revival of learning. But the scandalous stories he there heard about the comparatively recent behaviour of Pope Alexander VI and Caesar Borgia, impressed him with the urgent need for ecclesiastical reform.

Returning to Oxford, Colet lectured on the works of the church and its system of religion, condemning its pre-occupation with power, money and pleasure, and denouncing the loose morals of the clergy. As for the popes, he spoke of them as *"wickedly distilling poison to the destruction of the Church"* (Seeborn, *"The Era of the Protestant Revolution"*, p 77).

In evidence of his sincerity as an honest Catholic committed to reforming his church, Colet cried:

"Oh Jesu Christ, wash for us not our feet only, but also our hands and our head! Otherwise our disordered Church cannot be far from death". (ibid p 78)

It was into such an environment that Erasmus arrived when he accepted the invitation of an English nobleman to attend Oxford in order to further his knowledge of Greek. There he came to know Colet. Both were just thirty years of age.

But there the similarity ended, for Colet was a spiritual and religious reformer. He was seeking to lead the minds of his pupils away from the scholastic system and back to the Bible as the Christian's authority. On the other hand, Erasmus was motivated by a thirst for a knowledge of Greek in order that he might better appreciate the classics and the new learning. But now as he listened to Colet drawing his students to the Bible and the gospel story, he was shown for the first time that salvation is a personal experience, found only in Jesus Christ - not a ritualistic system of salvation as devised by man and dispensed by the church.

Erasmus was fascinated by Colet's expositions of Scripture and his historical method of interpretation. Gradually, he came to appreciate what Colet was trying to achieve and when invited by Colet to join him in his mission Erasmus declined, saying that he must first go to Italy to master Greek and then, *"when I feel I have the needful firmness and strength, I will join you"* (*ibid* p 80).

The course of history is studded with epoch-making decisions; decisions which were made on the spur of the moment, or which were the outcome of deliberation. But here was a decision which, although unforeseen by these two scholars, was to alter the whole course of civilisation, the results of which we all enjoy to this day.

In the event, Erasmus was not able to proceed directly to Italy. On the first stage of his intended journey, he was robbed of his money by a customs-house officer at Dover. In France, he was unsuccessful in raising money to continue on to Italy. In those times, many famous scholars were dependant on the generosity of their benefactors and Erasmus was no exception. It seems that he spent the next few years wandering around France and Holland. His biographer gives us an inkling of his life during this period of frustration:

"if it were possible, it would perhaps be hardly worth while, to trace all the wanderings of Erasmus during the next half-dozen years. It may suffice to say that he lived principally in Paris, Orleans, and in the Low

Countries, and spent his time in studying Greek, running away from the plague, dreaming of Italy, and begging hard from his patrons to supply him with the means of going there" (Drummond, "Erasmus", Vol.1, p 92).

Typifying his problems and ambitions at this time, is this extract from a letter written from Paris (circa 1500) to one of his patrons, James Battus:

"In autumn I shall, if possible, visit Italy and take my doctor's degree; see you, in whom I hope, that I am provided with means. I have been giving my whole mind to the study of Greek, and as soon as I get money I shall buy, first, Greek books, and then clothes. Farewell my dear Battus, and do not forget your friend Erasmus. Once my health is mended I shall neglect nothing" (ibid pp 95,96).

In spite of financial and health problems, it is quite evident that Erasmus had never lost sight of his goal to produce a Greek edition of the New Testament. As part of his preparation for this work, Drummond tells us that he sought out and collated manuscripts wherever he had the opportunity. While yet in Paris, *"As early as the year 1505, he had appeared as a critic of the Greek text, not however in his own name, but as editor of the Annotations of Laurentius Valla" (ibid p 307).*

Such study and work had gained a recognition in England, for upon visiting there early in 1506, he was made Bachelor of Divinity by Cambridge University. There his old friends rallied around him and within six months he was able to set out on his second and successful attempt to visit Italy.

After a laborious trip across the Alps (for the saddle was the means of transport then), Erasmus arrived in Turin, Northern Italy. There he remained for several weeks, during which time the prestigious University conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Next, he visited Florence and Bologna. While in Bologna, Erasmus became friendly with a "public

Professor of Greek" engaged by the Bologna University. This friendship with Paul Bombasius was later to prove invaluable to Erasmus while translating his New Testament. By that time, Bombasius had been made secretary to Cardinal Pucci, who gladly assisted Erasmus by providing him with readings from the Codex Vaticanus.

His visit to Rome in 1507 appears to have been relatively short, yet he was able to make the acquaintance of Cardinal de Medici who was so sympathetic with Erasmus's ambitions for a Greek New Testament that later, when he became Pope Leo X, Erasmus dedicated it to him.

Erasmus's visit to Italy must have lived up to his expectations. There he had not only taken the opportunity to examine rare and valuable manuscripts but he had engaged the minds of scholars who had helped settle in his mind the line of manuscripts which he should use in his planned forthcoming Greek translation of the New Testament. Now he would return to England as a Doctor of Divinity with an invitation from none other than King Henry VIII.

With such illustrious credentials, and back now among his friends of Oxonian days, it is not surprising that he was appointed Greek Professor at Cambridge, a position which he was to hold from 1510 to 1514. And now Erasmus was to find among his English pupils a student of Greek who was destined to leave an indelible mark on English literature and society. He was William Tyndale.

The pupils of Erasmus were fully aware of his desire to produce a Greek New Testament which scholars of all nations could use to translate into their own language. There can be little doubt that Tyndale there gained a desire to give the English people a Bible of their own. But it would not be a translation of the Roman Catholic Vulgate as was the Bible of Wycliffe, for Erasmus had shown him that the Latin Vulgate "swarmed with errors" (D'Aubigne's *"History of the Reformation"*, Book 1, Chap. VIII).

It was during the month of April, 1515, that Erasmus was to receive word from a friend in Basle that a famous German

printer by the name of Froben wanted to print his New Testament. Here was wonderful news for Erasmus. By this time, his many dissertations on the state of the church had spread his fame abroad.

Now Erasmus could fulfil his pledge to Colet in a way that could not be compared to his previous writings. With his proposed New Testament, he would not only realise Colet's ambition to draw men away from the prevailing scholastic theology, but he would, *"place before them, in all the freshness of the original"* a new translation of the *"living picture of Christ and His Apostles contained in the New Testament"* ("The Era of the Protestant Revolution", p 92).

It should be realised that, at this time, the Latin New Testament in use by the church was substantially that of Jerome's late fourth century translation. Along with the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, it constituted the Bible shortly to be re-affirmed and authorised by the Council of Trent (1545-1563). Drummond's comments are instructive:

"To the monks and theologians of that day it was the Bible as much as if no originals had existed, or as if Hebrew Prophets and Galilean Apostles had written in Latin" ("Erasmus", p 309).

Drummond continues:

"No one had been sufficiently enterprising or sufficiently zealous in the cause of religious progress to edit or to print the Christian Scriptures in the original tongue. The truth is that those who were interested in religion cared very little for learning; while most of those who were interested in learning cared not at all for religion" (ibid).

This is where Erasmus differed greatly from the learned humanists of his day. He cared for the literature of the "new learning" but he had (thanks to Colet) great respect for God's Word. It is a gross insult, based on questionable motives, for his modern day critics and enemies to discredit him as a

humanist, a term devised by Rome to denigrate those scholars who threatened her religious system with the "new learning" and which today is used to designate an irreligious class of people.

After proceeding to Basle, Erasmus busily engaged himself in finishing off his translation of the New Testament which consisted of two columns containing the Latin and Greek side by side, as well as his own annotations.

The great day came, when on the first of March, 1516, Erasmus had the satisfaction of seeing his long-cherished ambition climaxed with the publishing of his New Testament. The work carried a Dedication to Pope Leo X, an indication that Erasmus ever remained a loyal Roman Catholic, in spite of the fact that he had been so critical of the conduct of the clergy and of much of its dogma. Interestingly, it seems that the pope was quite appreciative of the compliment, at first that is, for it was not long before the church was branding Erasmus as a "second Lucian".¹

In his preface, Erasmus reveals his desires which by no stretch of the imagination could be equated with those of a humanist:

"I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospels - should read the Epistle of Paul; and I wish that they were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens" ("The Era of the Protestant Revolution", p 92).

¹ "Furious monks loaded him with abuse from the pulpits: "they called him a second Lucian - a fox that had laid waste the Lord's vineyard" (D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation", Book 1, Chapter VIII).

It is not stated to which Lucian they are referring, but as we shall see in Section 2, the text which Erasmus used in his translation of the New Testament was virtually the one certified by Lucian of Antioch which formed the basis of the Waldensian and Greek Bibles. These were known as the Traditional Text and became the progenitors of the later-named Received Text.

The demand for Erasmus's New Testament was such that another printing was needed within three years. His second edition appeared early in 1519 and like all responsible authors, he took the opportunity to make corrections. This edition which had a greatly improved Latin Text carried a "papal Brief"... which spoke in the highest terms both of the scholarship and orthodoxy of the work. Yet:

"But one thing was clear to the commonest understanding: he had departed from the Vulgate translation, and had substituted comparatively pure Latin for its intolerable barbarisms" (Drummond "Erasmus", Vol.1, pp 313-314).

With such a departure from the church's Vulgate, it is not surprising that his work was soon vigorously attacked, and the more so as the editions multiplied. His fifth edition appeared just one year prior to his death in 1536. These charges not only persist to this day but they have taken on a more vindictive nature by those who wish to uphold Rome's Bible.

One common charge is that Erasmus was too hasty in his translation which suffered from a paucity of manuscripts. Drummond answers this charge:

"As to the charge that Erasmus had been guilty of carelessness and dishonesty in not consulting more than one manuscript, it was simply absurd. He had, in fact, consulted many in England, in Brabant, and at Basle, and at different times had had in his hands a greater number than Valla² (ibid p 331).

To the above defence, we could add the experience Erasmus had gained while wandering around Europe and Italy, both in examination of manuscripts and in his discussions with learned

² "Laurentius Valla, the only humanist of distinction born in Rome ... He combined classical with theological erudition and attained an influence almost equal to that enjoyed by Erasmus several generations later" (Schaff - "History of the Christian Church", p 595).

classical scholars. Later critics on this score have been more generous, claiming that Erasmus had only five manuscripts to consult in Basle. But it seems that even this is an understatement, for Drummond says:

"Erasmus himself, however, seems to say that he used at least nine manuscripts, as he says in the Apologia prefixed to his first edition" (ibid p 311).

But what does it really matter? If Erasmus had researched his project thoroughly, and then selected one manuscript, it would be the one which he considered representative of the purest text. Nolan, in his definitive work, "Inquiry", adds his weight to such a conclusion. He says:

"The two great families of Greek Bibles are well illustrated in the work of the outstanding scholar, Erasmus. Before he gave to the Reformation the New Testament in Greek, he divided all Greek manuscripts into two classes: those which agreed with the Received Text and those which agreed with the Vaticanus Manuscript" ("Inquiry", p 413).

In connection with this statement, it is here appropriate to observe that the manuscripts of the Received Text Line are also known as the Traditional or Majority Texts, simply because they were traditionally regarded as the purest and were overwhelmingly in the majority. Says Wilkinson:

"So vast is this majority that even the enemies of the Received Text admit that nineteen-twentieths and some ninety-nine one-hundredths of all Greek MSS are of this class, while one hundred percent of the Hebrew MSS are for the Received Text" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 13).

It is highly significant that two of the world's most prominent Christian scholars of the day, had no problems with Erasmus's New Testament. We refer to Doctors Martin Luther and William Tyndale. Instantly they recognised his work as an

instrument by which they could give to their peoples the unadulterated gospel in their own language. The reforms planted by Wycliffe, which had lingered, struggling to survive in the climate of a defective Bible, were now to burst forth in the full power and beauty of the Protestant Reformation. The world would never be the same again.

Chapter Three

Tyndale the Brave

William Tyndale, the great Oxford and Cambridge scholar of the early sixteenth century, had a natural bent for languages. It is claimed that he could speak as naturally in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish and French as in his native English.

His knowledge of New Testament Greek had been finely honed by Holland's intellectual giant, Desiderius Erasmus, who had graced the halls of Cambridge as a teacher from 1510-1514. Erasmus's extensive research into the history of the Greek New Testament caused him to divide the manuscripts into two classes; those which agreed substantially with what we now call the Received Text (*Textus Receptus*) as used by the Waldenses and the Byzantine church, and those which agreed with the Vaticanus manuscript, the treasure of the Roman Catholic Church (Nolan, "The Integrity of the Greek Vulgate", pp 413, 414).

Both of these men stood out as intellectual towers in an age that was noted for its superb scholarship. History has shown that Tyndale not only left his mould on English thinking for generations to come, but he actually provided a solid base for the development of the English language which at that time was emerging as a fine vehicle of expression.

But it was not academic training alone which fitted Tyndale for his dynamic role in shaping the social and religious affairs of an emerging Reformationist England as a mighty bastion of Protestantism. He was a committed Christian who determined that no obstacle should prevent the attainment of his ambition to make available to the common people the pure Word of God.

One day, while arguing with some priests and exhorting them to study the Scriptures instead of blindly accepting the pronouncement of the pope as authority, Tyndale gave voice to his ambition:

"If God spares my life, I will take care that a ploughboy shall know more of the Scriptures than you do."
(D'Aubigne, "History of the Reformation", Book XVIII, Chapter 4)

It was this commitment which was later to lead to his martyrdom - a price which he was quite prepared to pay in the achievement of his goal.

His great opportunity came when his mentor, Erasmus, published his printed translation of the New Testament in Greek. At once, like the German monk, Martin Luther, Tyndale recognised Erasmus's translation as God's immortal gift to man. Here was a work which rejected the text of the Catholic Vulgate in favour of those manuscripts which were not only in the vast majority, but had an outstanding history of Syrian, Greek and Waldensian usage. The Vulgate could boast no such pedigree. It had been consistently used in areas where Rome had exercised political and religious control and because of early corruptions in Alexandria and Rome, it had come to be distinguished, as were its antecedents, as the Alexandrian and Western lines of Bibles.

With Erasmus's translation, Tyndale knew that he now had a tool which had not been available to his predecessor, John Wycliffe, who some one and a half centuries earlier had questioned the infallibility of the pope and given to the English a Bible in their own language. Being a bald translation of the Roman Catholic Vulgate, it contained most of the errors of the Alexandrian line. His Bible preceded the invention of printing, so, being very expensive, it could only be read by a privileged few.

Although Wycliffe has been justly called "The Morning Star of the Reformation", the world only caught a glimmer of the daybreak as his translation from a text favoured by the papal

hierarchy was not able fully to penetrate the all-pervading fog of the Dark Ages.

Tyndale knew that his cherished task would not be easy. England was still Roman Catholic. The reigning monarch, Henry VIII, was a Catholic and a staunch defender of ritualism. The pope had conferred on him the title, "Defender of the Faith" which the British sovereigns carry to this day. He had no time for Protestantism. Yet even he had been influenced by criticisms of the papacy by Colet and Erasmus. When he eventually quarrelled with the Roman hierarchy, it was more over political differences than religious ones. He was quite happy to maintain the ritualism and pomp of Catholic worship, but he refused the notion of papal authority over both church and state. Later, in 1534, the English parliament abrogated papal supremacy in favour of the King.

The High Church of England even to this day reflects Henry's attitudes in that it is content to retain many Roman practices and beliefs, yet it does not acknowledge, at least outwardly, the authority of the pope.

Henry VIII had done nothing to hinder the church's hostility to Wycliffe's English Bible and made no secret of his aversion to reformers like Luther. Tyndale realised that Henry would give him no support in a likely confrontation with the Catholic clergy.

But in Germany, things were different. The invention of printing in Mainz in 1440 enabled cheap and wide distribution of ideas. Already Luther's pronouncements and writings against the papal system were bearing much fruit. In 1522, Luther had been successful in bringing out his German-language New Testament. Tyndale determined to enhance his chances of producing an English Bible by exiling himself in Germany. In 1524 he left his beloved homeland and settled down in Hamburg to the work of translation.

But the tentacles of Rome were long and strong. No sooner had Tyndale arranged to have his Bible printed in Cologne than he was forced to hurriedly gather up his precious manuscripts and flee with them to Worms. There, in 1525, he was

successful in having the New Testament printed, but he still had the problem of getting the Bibles into England where the Catholic bishops had been influential in obtaining a blockade on what was regarded as dangerous merchandise. And so it was - and remains to this day - in the eyes of popery.

In order to circumvent the blockade, Tyndale's helpers were forced to invent ways to secrete the Bibles among items of merchandise. In this way, most of the Bibles eluded seizure and the consequent sacrilege of a public burning. Indeed, one such burning took place in 1530 when the Bishop of London supervised an *auto da fe*³ type of ceremony in the church yard of St Paul's Cathedral. By 1534 Tyndale had not only produced an amended edition of his New Testament, but had also translated much of the Old Testament.

In spite of continuing hostility, thousands were soon eagerly devouring the precious Words of Life. But the very success of "Operation People's Bible" ensured swift papal revenge. Tyndale had foreseen his fate when he made the remark: *"If they burn me also [a reference to the burning of his Testaments] they shall do no other than I look for"*.

Sure enough, the papal emissaries hunted him down and incarcerated him in a dungeon in Flanders. On October 6, 1536, he was chained to the stake. Mercifully, he was strangled before the flames of papal intolerance and revenge were applied to the faggots, but not before he was able to utter a prayer for his beloved country: *"Lord, open the King of England's eyes"*. He was fifty-three years of age, a hero of the cross, a martyr and a pioneer Reformer. Did he realise that he was responsible for setting England on a collision course with Rome and that his Bible, along with Luther's, was the opening salvo of a broadside of truth that would release Europe from the iron grip of the Vatican?

Three years later, Catholicism received another blast when the French received their Olivetan Bible. All of these translations

³ "Auto da fe" is a Spanish term meaning "Act of faith", the name given by Rome to the ceremony of the public burning of heretics.

substantially agreed with the New Testament text of Erasmus, and recognising their strong apostolic tradition, Rome correctly branded them as "Waldensian Bibles". (see Comba, "The Waldenses of Italy", p 192)

Chapter Four

Protestantism's Early Struggle to Survive

Tyndale's dying prayer for England was partially answered within three years. His Bible quickly won many friends, one of whom was Thomas Cranmer. Like the king, Archbishop Cranmer was a Roman Catholic; hence he saw no reason as a cleric to shun politics. He was very close to Henry VIII - so close that he is reported to have facilitated the King's two divorces.

Cranmer seized his advantage with the King and sought to win him over to Tyndale's New Testament, but Henry had no time whatever for Tyndale whom he considered of the same mould as his mentor, Erasmus, who had well and truly outraged the church with his satirical criticism of the priesthood. Hence he found it politically expedient to spurn Tyndale's translation.

In 1535 there appeared in England the first complete printed Bible, by Miles Coverdale. His New Testament was a slight revision of Tyndale's. This was closely followed by the Matthews Bible (1537), so named for the pen-name used by John Rogers. Tyndale had turned over to Rogers his translation material for the Old Testament at the time of his imprisonment.

Although these Bibles were in agreement with Tyndale's, they were more acceptable to Henry, not only because they bore the names of other translators, but they no longer contained Tyndale's comments and notes.

Coverdale was soon commissioned to prepare another version, based on the Matthews Bible. This came out in 1539 and was called the Great Bible because of its size - 16½ x 11 inches. This Bible obtained the approval of King Henry and he ordered

a copy to be placed in every church.

Little by little, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, was surely becoming a Protestant Reformer. Did he realise that his course and the influence he was having on the King would lead him to the same fate as befell Tyndale?

As King Henry's court was still virtually Roman Catholic, Cranmer often experienced the emotional pangs common to the lone Reformer. But with the death of Henry in 1547, Cranmer was to gain a staunch ally in his heir, King Edward VI. Born of Jane Seymour, the third of Henry's wives, he became an ardent Reformer and between them he and Cranmer were able to greatly advance the cause of Protestantism. Reforming preachers seemed to burst forth as plants released from winter's icy grip reach up and absorb the life-giving warmth of the sun. Only this time, England's clergy were experiencing the spiritual growth that comes from the "Sun of Righteousness". Such names as Ridley, Latimer, Rogers, Hooper, Bradford and Saunders soon became famous Protestant identities.

But this euphoric time of emergence from popery was to be short-lived. In 1553 King Edward went to a premature grave, but the effect which he had in nurturing the seedlings of Protestantism was vital and long-lasting. When Archbishop Cranmer sorrowfully conducted his king's funeral service, could he have possibly realised that this would be his last official duty?

And so it was! Edward's half-sister Mary, daughter of the Spanish Catherine of Aragon, and, like her mother, fiercely Catholic, next ascended the throne of England, but only after solemnly swearing that she would allow freedom of religion. But no sooner had she been crowned than she discarded her pretence and proceeded to displace Protestant leaders. She ordered Cranmer to be confined to his house and put a Roman Catholic in his place.

Within a few weeks, Coverdale, the Bible translator, together with other Reformers, found himself in gaol. Grafton and Whitchurch, who had printed Coverdale's Bible, fell from grace. It was soon evident that Mary was determined to return

England to Catholicism. Protestant ministers were speedily replaced by ignorant priests whose mass and liturgy were performed in Latin. They had absolutely no use for a Bible in the vernacular, let alone a Protestant one.

Queen Mary's piety for the faith of her Spanish mother did not go unnoticed in the Holy Roman Empire. Emperor Charles V, ruler of Spain and the greater part of Western Europe, had acquired much of his empire through the fashionable expedient of inter-marriage with European royalty. As his father had been honoured with the title of "Most Catholic King", and had acquired vast wealth from the spices, silver and gold from the Indies and the Americas, few potentates felt in a position to ignore his advances. If he could arrange the marriage of his only son Philip to Queen Mary, he would not only bring England within his own political orbit but would enlist her as an ally in subjugating his troublous neighbour, France. Thus he would secure a sizeable block of Europe against the enemies of Spain and the Holy Catholic Church. Furthermore, if the marriage were to produce a son, he would automatically become the rightful heir to the English throne, and another peaceful Spanish conquest would eventuate.

It so happened that at the age of twenty-seven, Philip was very eligible. The fact that Mary was eleven years his senior was quite irrelevant to the cause. Philip, ever the dutiful son and a lackey of the pope, was willing. Could Mary be persuaded to lay aside her spinster-driven thoughts of marital martyrdom to secure the future of a papal empire? Most certainly she would!

For the English, such a match did not hold popular appeal. The possibility of an heir born to a Spanish king and a half-Spanish queen was fraught with danger to England's sovereignty. A poorly-prepared insurrection led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, whose battle cry was "No Spanish match! No Inquisition!", was a failure and resulted in the loss of his head with others of his supporters also being executed.

On June 25, 1554, the royal pair were married in Winchester Cathedral as equals in rank, for Philip's father, the Emperor

Charles, had kept his part of the bargain by announcing his intention of abdicating the throne so that Mary could marry a king.

Before the year was out, the royal couple were to bask in the sunshine of the pope's blessing by his appointment of Cardinal Pole as Papal Legate to England. Thus was a wayward England reconciled to Rome and accepted into the bosom of the church.

Mary lost no time in vindicating the pope's faith in Catholic England. To the yoke of Rome she would now add the sword of Spain! There was that troublesome Vicar, John Rogers, who recently had flouted the laws of priestly celibacy by taking himself a wife and then having the temerity to get up at St Paul's Cross and condemn popery. Mary's henchmen had been keeping a watchful eye on this heretic who had shown his true colours back in the days of her brother's reign when he collaborated with Tyndale and Coverdale to produce those "wretched" Protestant Bibles. Not satisfied with that, he had gone on to produce an updated version of his own under the pseudonym of "Matthew's" Bible. So in 1555, amidst the protest of a great crowd of her subjects, she had Rogers burnt at the stake in Smithfield.

Having unwittingly immortalised Rogers as the first of her many martyrs, there seemed to be no limit to the manifestations of Mary's papal zeal. Her Catholic court instructed justices in each of England's counties to appoint secret informers to spy on her subjects and report on those who did not attend Mass and who generally failed to conduct themselves in the manner of good Catholics.

A popish triumvirate consisting of Bishop Bonner of London, Bishop Gardiner of Winchester and Cardinal Pole, was invested with the powers of deciding who should have freedom or imprisonment, life or death. As a consequence, England's gaols began receiving a seemingly endless stream of "stubborn" clerics and hapless citizens. Fires of vengeance flared in Gloucester, Coventry, Hadleigh and other parts of Suffolk, Carmarthen in Wales, Canterbury and Oxford.

Among those who perished for their faith were such

prominent friends of the open Bible as Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, the latter having been associated with the production of "The Great Bible". These names are immortalised in British Protestant history and their martyrdom commemorated even in the antipodes, where in the splendid city of Christchurch, New Zealand, is a magnificent Anglican cathedral set amidst three civic squares, each proudly bearing one of the illustrious martyrs' names.

It would be remiss not to mention that laymen and women also were prepared to witness to their Protestant faith. We shall here mention the case of William Hunter, a mere youth of eighteen years, yet in possession of a maturity of Christian experience that enabled him to be faithful unto death--even the death of the fiery stake. His experience is especially pertinent to the purpose of this book in that it underlines the intense hatred of Rome for the Protestant Bible and demonstrates the importance which Rome attaches to the open Bible in relation to the part it played in the Reformation.

One day in 1554, an officer of the bishop's court reprimanded William for reading the Bible. "*Why meddlest thou with the Bible?.... Canst thou expound Scripture?*" William replied: "*I presume not to expound Scripture: ... I read for my comfort and edification.*" He was reported to a neighbouring priest who inquired of him as to who had given him permission to read the Bible. After giving the priest a similar answer to that given to the officer, William was branded a heretic and marked for future attention.

That attention consisted of numerous opportunities to reaffirm his rejection of transubstantiation and the priestly confessional as he was passed along the hierarchical chain that inevitably led to free boarding arrangements in one of Her Majesty's prisons. There he was kept in irons for nine months, save for periodic visits to the bishop's inquisition which usually ended in cajoling, threats and damnations.

On March 27, 1555, at the tender age of nineteen, he was led to the stake and kneeling down on "a wet brown faggot" he took comfort by reading aloud the fifty-first Psalm.

And now we see an example of the almost unbelievable hatred which the Romanists harboured against the Protestant Bible and those who trusted in it. Coming to verse seventeen, William read; *"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise"*.

"Thou liest, heretic! Thou readest false!" came the rejoinder, *"for the words are an humble spirit! The translation saith 'a contrite heart'"* replied William. "Yes," said his tormentor, *"the translation is false; you translate books as you please yourselves, like heretics"* (Source - **"Foxe's Book of Martyrs"**, p 235).

According to Foxe's account, William Hunter claimed there was no great difference between the words "humble" and "contrite", which all reasonable persons could go along with. But Bonner's bullies were not reasonable people and here we have a striking insight into the way in which Rome translates and then interprets Scripture to suit the occasion.

The Scriptures of the Received Text do not employ the word "humble" which was exactly what Rome's threats of torture were all about - humbling a man by forcing him to obey man. Whereas the word "contrite" not only encompasses "humbleness" but has the added spiritual connotation of "being broken-hearted for sin" (Collins). In the circumstances, what must have appeared to young William as puerile semantics and hair splitting, can be seen in retrospect as Rome's deadly serious abuse of Scripture. Here is an example of the superiority of the Received Text in transmitting God's Word to man.

And so, with this manifestation of hatred towards God's Word and those who treasured it, a young "contrite heart" went to his terrible death with a vision of popish bigotry and hatred seared upon his mind, only to be erased by the consuming flames.

Mercifully, Queen Mary had a short life and even shorter reign, dying on November 17, 1558, at the age of forty-two. Although her reign lasted only five years, it was long enough for her to have justly earned the title of "Bloody Mary".

From the martyrdom of Vicar Rogers until just two days prior

to her decease when five victims of her misplaced zeal were burned at Canterbury, it is estimated by Lord Burleigh that no fewer than two hundred and eighty-eight persons were burned at the stake. Innumerable others perished by imprisonment, torture, sickness and starvation. (Close, "**Defeat of the Spanish Armada**", p 23).

Providentially, Mary had no children to Philip, thereby denying him the satisfaction of turning England into a Spanish dependency; a providential happening which is probably responsible for the fact that this book is written in English - or even written at all!

Chapter Five

The Reformation Prospers

Within a few hours of Bloody Mary's passing the papal legate, Cardinal Pole, breathed his last. As the news of the dual deaths spread around England, a majority of the people saw it as a double cause for rejoicing. Church steeples peeled out the joy of the citizens and evening bonfires lit up the sky, while parties of excited citizens danced, ate and made merry in the streets. At once it was apparent that the recently enforced Catholicism had fooled no one. The spontaneous jubilation was an expression of relief from people who, for the vast majority, had experienced the reign of both Protestant and Roman Catholic monarchs and had suffered under the latter. "God save Queen Elizabeth" was the popular chorus reverberating throughout the land, for it was spread abroad that Elizabeth, half-sister to the late queen, was a committed Protestant.

And so she proved to be! But this did not prevent the wily Philip of Spain from making her a proposal of marriage. Her reply curtly informed him that she "*had espoused her kingdom*" ("**Foxe's Book of Martyrs**", p 329).

Elizabeth had to proceed with what she saw as her life's mission with the utmost sagacity and caution. Mary's legacy to England was a realm infested with papal plotters and Catholic preachers who instituted a campaign to cast doubt on the legitimacy of Elizabeth's birth and hence her succession.

During her half-sister's reign, the pulpits had been "cleansed" of Protestant clergymen who had either fled the country or been liquidated by her consent or command. In order to bring the churches back under Protestant control, Elizabeth invited the

exiled Reformers to return. As they re-entered their homeland and resumed their ministry, they did so with renewed vigour and zeal, for while mixing with the Reformers of Europe, their love of truth had been strengthened and their spirits revived. With them they brought their Protestant Bibles from which they derived their strength.

One of Elizabeth's first moves against Catholicism's liturgy was to command that the Litany and the Gospels be read in English, and that the sacrifice of the Mass be discontinued.

It is worthy of notice, and to the credit of Elizabeth and the Protestant cause, that as the Catholic priests were replaced with Protestants, they were not arrested and punished as had been the case when Mary was queen. In contrast, and in keeping with the teaching of the true Head of Christianity, the displaced clergy were permitted to retire with dignity on a state pension. Where the Romanists erected the stake as their sign of authority, the Protestants set up the English Bible as their rule of faith. (See Close, "**Defeat of the Spanish Armada**", pp 25, 26).

Another compelling reason for caution was the fact that Scotland and France had forged a papal-inspired alliance. The heiress to the throne of Scotland, Mary Stuart, was the wife of France's Catholic King, Francis II. With the pope's blessing, he had assumed the title and arms of England and proclaimed his intention of using Scotland as a springboard for invading England with the aim of de-throning Elizabeth. With his wife Mary then enthroned in her place, England would once more be returned to the arms of a grateful pope.

But this threat was to be unexpectedly removed when on May 2, 1559, one of Scotland's exiled Reformers suddenly arrived in Edinburgh. He was John Knox, already well known throughout Scotland, and his arrival caused consternation among Queen Mary's Council. Within a few days he was declared an outlaw by royal proclamation. This only served to broadcast the news of his return, which brought great joy and renewed hope to the beleaguered Reformers.

Their numbers had been steadily increasing as the news and

influence of the German Reformers reached Scotland, and translations of the Scriptures were extensively circulated. (Warner and Marten, *"The Groundwork of British History"*, p 299)

John Knox, although a religious man and a Reformer, was also a highly political person who believed in action. He travelled about Scotland holding rallies, generally lifting the depressed spirits of the Reformers. At one such meeting in Perth, he preached a sermon denouncing idolatry. His audience was so convicted that they rushed off and attacked and destroyed monasteries and other religious houses. *"Burn the nests and the rooks will fly,"* cried Knox (*ibid* p 302).

When eventually he went the way of all flesh and rested beneath his epitaph, all would agree with the truth written there *"Here lies one who never feared the face of man"*.

The tide of opinion quickly turned against the popish-controlled government, a circumstance which soon neutralised any threat to England and resulted in imprisonment for the Scottish Queen. With both England and Scotland now well on the way to becoming Protestant countries, they, for the first time had a common bond which would eventually bring about that political union which we know today as Great Britain.

But, just as importantly, with this union there arose a Protestant alliance which was to flourish throughout the British Empire. When the Empire lost its colonies in North America, the Protestant bond not only remained, but strengthened. Within this alliance, there arose the great Bible Societies which propelled the Protestant Bibles to the uttermost parts of the world.

Chapter Six

The Council of Trent

We have noted the great influence which the Reformation in Europe was having on England and Scotland in particular; and it was to Protestant areas of Europe that many a persecuted Reformer fled for safety and succour.

At the time of John Knox's return to Scotland, Geneva had become a busy centre for Bible translation. Calvin, a relative of the Waldensian, Olivetan, who translated the New Testament into the French language, had edited a second edition of his Bible. This Waldensian Bible then became the basis of an English-language Bible which came to be known as the Geneva Bible because it was translated in Geneva. For the first time, a complete English Bible was divided into verses.

By 1560, this Geneva Bible was being enthusiastically adopted by Protestant England and Scotland where it was to remain the leading version until it was finally superseded by the King James Version of 1611.

It was this line of Bibles which came to be known as the Received Text. This line, preserved during the Dark Ages by the churches of the wilderness, inspired the Reformation and resulted in catastrophe for Roman Catholicism.

Rome could not let the use of the Protestant Bible, with its religious and political consequences, go unchallenged. In 1545 the Vatican assembled a council of war against the Reformation. Known as the Council of Trent, it was prolonged until the year 1563.

Very early in its deliberations, the Council was seen to give recognition to, and allow itself to be dominated by, a

recently-formed sect of the Roman Catholic Church known as the Society of Jesus, whose members are commonly referred to as Jesuits. Their principal founder, Ignatius Lyola, is described in Collin's Dictionary as *"a crafty person, an intriguer (an opprobrious use of the word)"* while Jesuitism is defined as: *"the principles and practices of the Jesuits; cunning deceit; deceptive practices to effect a purpose"*. The perceived aim of the Society is to protect Roman Catholicism by destroying Protestantism.

When we consider Protestantism's forceful and consistent denunciations of Romanism in those times, its gross immorality, its intrigue and false religion, it would be expected that meeting these charges would be high on the Council's list of priorities. But this was not the case.

Instead, the very first subject to be discussed at the Council was the Scriptures and the supremacy of the Vulgate's Latin text. Here is cogent testimony to Rome's acknowledgment of the prime-mover of the Reformation - the Waldensian Bibles. The members of the Council were particularly obsessed with Luther, his Bible and his Bible-based propositions derived therefrom, and so they listed four of his propositions and condemned them outright as works of rank heresy. Below are Luther's four propositions:

Condemnation 1.

"That the Holy Scriptures contained all things necessary to salvation, and that it was impious to place apostolic tradition on a level with Scripture".

Condemnation 2.

"That certain books accepted as canonical in the Vulgate were apocryphal and not canonical".

Condemnation 3.

"That Scripture must be studied in the original languages, and that there were errors in the Vulgate".

Condemnation 4.

"That the meaning of Scripture is plain, and that it can be understood without commentary with the help of Christ's Spirit" (See Froude, "Council of Trent", pp 174, 175).

By these condemnations the Council of Trent decreed that:

1. Church authority was of equal authority with Scripture.
2. That the Apocryphal books were as inspired as the canonical ones.
3. That the Vulgate did not contain error and required no correcting.
4. That the Scriptures needed to be, and could only be, interpreted by the Catholic Church.

Even as the Council was deliberating, news of Knox's return to Scotland (1559) stung the Council into renewed vigour in planning their counter-attack on the Reformation. The Isles across the Channel came to be increasingly seen as the main threat to Roman Catholicism as the leadership of the Reformation appeared to be passing from Germany to England. Therefore England must become the focus of the counter-Reformation. Subsequent events have shown how a broadly based three-fold plan of action was immediately initiated:

1. Destroy the Reformation's spiritual base by bringing about a

loss of confidence in its Bible and replace it with the Vulgate.

2. Infiltrate Protestant pulpits, schools and public institutions and fill the country with spies, preferably English ones.
3. Remove the Protestant government by intrigue, murder and, if necessary, by armed conquest.

In 1562, the year before the Council of Trent ended, the "most Catholic" of king's son, Philip II of Spain, opened a college at Douay, in his realm of the Netherlands.

This seminary was ostensibly established for the purpose of providing training for English Catholic students who either found themselves unwelcome at Oxford and Cambridge or whose religious scruples prevented them attending such colleges. J.G. Carleton, D.D. tells us that the originator of the project was really none other than an English clergyman named William Allen, who, at Elizabeth's succession, found it convenient to quit his position as Canon of York and Principal of St Mary's College, Oxford. He became the first president of a similar college at Rheims. ("*Rheims and the English Bible*", p 13).

Allen was typical of a growing number of English traitors whose loyalty to the pope and his earthly aspirations overshadowed any notion of allegiance to the crown of England. He is described by Carleton as one "*best known as an active participator in the political intrigues of his day*" (ibid).

But such a description gives little indication of the extent of Allen's seditious activities. The real purpose of the seminary and its Jesuit-run subsidiary college, was to train English priests who would return to England as spies and counter-Reformationists. He was also responsible for later setting up another English college in Rome. Between them, these three colleges would orchestrate a well-planned, double-pronged attack on England and Protestantism. The first prong would consist of the translation of their Vulgate Bible into English and

the second would consist of the training and supervising of subversive activities in the religious and political life of England. The ultimate goal was the installation of a papal-friendly government.

The task of translating the New Testament was given to the Jesuits at Rheims. The fact that it took some two decades to complete is indicative of the patience and perseverance that characterises Rome's far-sightedness.

But the work of infiltration and intrigue began almost immediately. In 1567, two Jesuit priests, Saunders and Parsons, both Englishmen, were discovered itinerating in England, with authority from the pope to absolve all who would return to the Roman fold. Pope Pius sought to encourage any wavering Catholics when in May, 1570 he openly declared papal warfare against England by issuing a Bull excommunicating Queen Elizabeth. Especially would this encourage the support of the numerous Roman Catholics and their political supporters who now found their Romish aspiration disadvantaged under a Protestant regime.

Not the least of these were the deposed Roman clergy whom Elizabeth had magnanimously allowed to live on in a civilised state of retirement - an act which no doubt the pope saw as a fortuitous oversight which could be turned to his advantage.

Soon England was crawling with spies. Numerous plots to murder the Queen were uncovered. Weapons such as stilettos and exotic poisons supplemented the formal clerical tools like catechisms, rosaries and holy water. (See Close, *"The Defeat of the Spanish Armada"*, p 32).

The English Parliament reacted by issuing edicts making it a treasonable offence to brand the Queen as a heretic and a usurper of the throne, and another, prohibited the publication of any Bull or absolution from the pope.

It was not long before Campion, an Oxonian who had been trained by the Jesuits, put the Government edict to the test. He was arrested while disguised as a soldier, along with three of his accomplices, all of whom were executed for high treason. Historian Albert Close makes this comment on such traitors:

"These are the men Roman Catholic historians delude their dupes into believing were martyrs".

Close then continues:

"Not a year passed after the arrival of the Jesuits, Campion and Parsons, without an insurrection or plot in some part of the Queen's dominions. The prisons of London contained numerous 'massing priests, sowers of sedition', charged with destroying the public peace and preaching disaffection to the Queen's Government and person" ("The Defeat of the Spanish Armada", p 33).

Chapter Seven

The Spanish Contender

King Philip II of Spain had been watching events in Elizabeth's realm with a suspicious eye. Ever since she had rebuffed his offer of marriage he had been inclined to let events take their natural course, meaning, letting Allen's men and the Jesuits attend to England. It was entirely feasible that these conspirators could very well succeed in placing Mary on the throne. Even after Mary had been imprisoned, Elizabeth had shown that she was loath to take her cousin's life. While there was life, there was hope.

Ever the artful diplomat, Elizabeth had repeatedly assured Philip of her country's friendship with Spain. But some of her government's actions had sorely tested his sense of honour. There was England's increasing support for the rebellious Reformers in the Netherlands. This part of the Spanish empire had long been held in the grip of Catholicism. With the advent of the Reformation, instigated by Luther and his Bible, a papal Inquisition had been set up which King Philip was later constrained to describe as being more pitiless than in Spain (Grierson, **"King of Two Worlds"**, p 86).

Back in 1568, Philip had negotiated a large loan with Genoese bankers for the support of his satrap in the Netherlands, the Duke of Alva. Alva was having trouble collecting sufficient taxes to support his war against the Protestant rebels. While the treasure was being transported to Alva in a convoy of Spanish ships, it drew the attention of some pirates. The convoy artfully dodged the pirates by seeking refuge in some of the Channel ports around Plymouth whereupon the English Government

promptly impounded the ships and removed the treasure.

But Queen Elizabeth was not wanting for an explanation to the justifiably outraged Philip. Her government had acted with *"the utmost propriety"*. She said, *"As the treasure had not yet been delivered, it was technically still the property of the bankers in Genoa. It was in everyone's interests that England had removed the treasure on shore to save it from almost certain seizure by the French pirates"*.

The Duke of Alva responded with alacrity and seized all English ships and merchandise in the Netherlands ports; so Elizabeth did not feel bound to release the confiscated treasure. As it was worth infinitely more than that seized by Alva, she was able to laugh all the way to the treasury!

Pope Gregory XIII was not slow to read Philip's mind. Over recent years he had been urging him to forcibly bring England into the Spanish domain and thus back into the fold of the Holy Catholic Church. But Philip was not inclined to respond to the pope's leading, for there was always that nagging thought that the troublesome French might take advantage of a Spain that was busily engaged in a major invasion.

Then there was the problem of neighbouring Portugal. Increasingly Spain's "brothers in the faith" and co-inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula, were challenging the supremacy of the sea lanes to Asia and the newly-acquired Americas. In 1580, after failing to achieve a peaceful settlement, Philip assembled an army under the command of the Duke of Alva, whom he had recalled from the Netherlands, and assembled it near the frontier with Portugal. When this intimidatory manoeuvre failed, it had to be war. Accordingly, early in 1581, Philip's army and navy converged on Lisbon. After only a token resistance the fighting ended and Philip found himself king of Portugal.

This was the apogee of Philip's reign. In one bold stroke he had acquired the vast empire of Portugal stretching from the Cape of Good Hope around the coast of Africa, across the Arabian Sea to India, the isles and archipelagos of the Indies and even through Indo-China to China itself. To his huge

empire in the Americas, Philip had added that vast territory in South America known as Brazil - so vast that the Amazon basin alone covered a land mass approximate in size to that great western bulge in Africa which encompasses the Sahara Desert. And, very importantly, he had virtually doubled the size of Spain's navy. Truly, Philip had brought Spain to the zenith of her power! Only England stood in his way to challenge his mastery of the seas.

Philip realised that England must be subdued. He had high hopes for the success of the subversive actions planned by Allen through the training at his college in Douay and those in Rheims and Rome. And then there was the long-awaited assault on the English Bible with the translation of the Vulgate into English at Rheims. If this Bible could capture the hearts of the English and return them to their former faith, it should be comparatively easy to topple the heretical government of Elizabeth by having her removed from power. It would not then be necessary to mount an outright invasion of England.

Even so, Philip, ever the cautious King, was determined to be prepared for all eventualities. Now that he had the Portuguese fleet at his disposal, an invasion of England had become a much more feasible proposition. He would proceed to secretly build the world's greatest armada, just in case!

Chapter Eight

Battle of the Bibles

It was not until 1582 that the long-expected Rheims version of the New Testament arrived in England. It caused no little apprehension among the Protestant clergy. Although the text did not appear to be much different from the Protestant Bible, yet the copious notes and explanations accompanying the text were glaringly obvious. The Jesuits were virtually interpreting the Bible to their church's own ends.

However, upon close examination, it became evident that the Scripture itself had in places been corrupted, mostly to support Roman dogma.

Of particular offence to Protestants was the way in which the Bible had been changed in order to support the confessional practice of dealing out penance for sins. Practically every time the word "*repent*" occurred in the Protestant New Testament, the Jesuits had rendered it, "*do penance*".

For instance, in Matthew 3:2, John the Baptist is made to say, "*Do penance for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*". Again in Acts 2:38, Peter is made to say, "*Do penance and be baptised*", and so on wherever we are exhorted in Protestant Bibles to repent - meaning to be sufficiently sorry for sin to turn about from our wicked ways.

It is very obvious that Rome's translation is intended to uphold her concept of salvation through suffering or works, or even by atoning contributions of money. The same rendering is found in the Douay Bible used presently by Roman Catholics.

Rome's real purpose in translating the Latin Vulgate into English was a dual one:

"The principal object of the Rheimish translators was not only to circulate their doctrines through the country

but also to depreciate as much as possible the English translations". ("Brooke's Cartwright", p 256).

By depreciating the Protestant Bible and destroying it as an authority, Rome could expect to restore papal and priestly power. And that authority not only extends over religious matters but also includes political and civil authority.

The importance of the Protestant Bibles in the overall development of the Reformation and the emergence of the British Empire is recognised by Warner and Martin in their book **"The Groundwork of British History"**:

"The translation of the Bible, for one thing, had worked on the side of Protestants, for though the Bible itself is on no side, yet the more the Bible was in man's hands, the more they inclined to judge in religious matters for themselves; and this habit of 'private judgment', in place of accepting private 'authority', is the basis of Protestantism." (ibid p 278).

Such a statement is indicative of many made by chroniclers of the development of the Reformation, yet they are simply stating a great Biblical truth as enunciated by the Founder of the Christian faith: *"And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"* (John 8:32).

But at the Council of Trent, Rome had said:

- *That the Latin Vulgate was the true Bible.*
- *That Scripture can only be interpreted by the church.*
- *That (Roman Catholic) tradition was of equal authority with Scripture.*

It soon became evident that the Jesuit New Testament was not capturing the minds and hearts of England and that the people were becoming even less disposed towards Catholicism. Increasingly, Allen and his Jesuit friends were turning to intrigue and murder.

In the year 1586, there came yet another plot known as the

Babington Conspiracy - so named after one of the chief conspirators. It had been conceived by an English traitor named John Ballard, a product and a fair sample of the priestly training at Rheims. There he had been taught that a sure way to earn a crown in Paradise through acceptable service to God, was to deprive Elizabeth of life and throne. Albert Close outlines the plan of action:

"The affair was to commence with the assassination of Elizabeth, then the Romanists in England were to be summoned to arms; and while the flames of insurrection should be raging within the kingdom, a foreign army was to land upon the coast, besiege and sack the cities that opposed them; raise Mary Stuart of Scotland to the throne, and establish the popish religion in England. ("The Defeat of the Spanish Armada", pp 33, 34).

Although the plan seemed quite feasible, it happened to be contrary to the plans of divine providence. Sir Frances Walsingham, a brilliant statesman and loyalist, early learned of the plot. He shrewdly allowed it to mature until he had identified the conspirators.

One of the letters intercepted by Walsingham was written by Mary, Queen of Scots, giving instructions to the conspirators. It was used at the ensuing trial to convict her and she forfeited not only any chance to occupy the throne of England, but also her head.

There is an interesting anecdote in connection with Mary's trial that relates to the attitude of the Court toward the Rheims Catholic Bible. When she was required to swear upon the Scriptures that she had not plotted against the life of Queen Elizabeth, the Earl of Kent declined to allow her to take the oath on the Rheims Version on the ground that, being *"a popish Testament"*, it was of *"no value"* in taking such an oath. (Geddes MacGregor, *"A Literary History of the Bible"*, 1968, p 161).

Chapter Nine

Invasion Preparations

The failed Babington Plot climaxed a series of botched conspiracies against Queen Elizabeth and her government. The success of John Knox in favour of the Protestant cause and the imprisonment of Scotland's Queen Mary had brought King Philip to the realisation that Scotland could no longer be used as a springboard for an assault on England. And now that Allen's plans to win the hearts of wavering Englishmen through the acceptance of the Jesuit Bible had failed, England had become indisputably the leader of the Reformation. The hopes of a popular uprising by Roman Catholics and their supporters had now faded.

King Philip's plans to increase the size of his fleet for an invasion of England were progressing slowly. Finance was his problem. But when in 1585, Sixtus V succeeded Gregory as pope, Philip saw a way out of his dilemma. Quickly, and with great gusto, Sixtus had taken up the Vatican's plan to crush England. Philip would put the pope's enthusiasm to the test and appeal to him for moral, political and financial support. In a submission to the pope, dated February 24, 1586, the Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See, wrote:

"Although his Majesty (Philip II) has been at different times admonished by the predecessors of his Holiness to undertake this enterprise, he never felt so convinced of the reality of the assistance he should obtain from them as he now confidently expects it from the courage and vigour of his Holiness" (From the transcript of a Dispatch in the Archives of Simancas, Spain; as cited

by Albert Close, "The Divine Programme of European History", p 100).

Among the points made in the submission was the avowed aim of the enterprise:

"to bring back that kingdom [England] to the obedience of the Roman Church, and to put in possession of it the Queen of Scotland, [Mary] who so well deserves it for having remained firm in the faith in the midst of such great calamities" (ibid pp 100, 101).

Having presented to the pope such a noble purpose for the proposed enterprise, Philip was not unmindful of the need to secure for the Spanish Monarchy an eventual advantage. So he sought an undertaking that after the death of Mary, the succession of the rightful heir, James, be set aside in favour of a member of Philip's family (ibid p 101).

The final, but vital point submitted to Pope Sixtus V, was the plea for financial help:

"His Majesty finds himself so much drained by the long wars of Flanders... that his Holiness should contribute for his share, two million of gold" (ibid p 101).

But, much as the pope was in sympathy with the plan, he was too astute to pay out 2,000,000 gold ducats for an expedition that had yet to materialise. He agreed only to a progressive method of payment. Pleading an exhausted Pontifical treasury, he offered the following:

*200,000 crowns as soon as the expedition sailed
100,000 crowns as soon as his army landed in England
100,000 crowns within another six months
200,000 crowns for every twelve months that the war continued.* (ibid p 102).

The pope also revealed the Vatican's mercenary instinct by insisting that its investment should be commercially sound:

"His Holiness's intention is that the Apostolic See

should recover and be effectually replaced in the possession of the revenues, rights, jurisdictions and actions which it formerly had in that kingdom before Henry VIII apostatised from the faith" (ibid p 102).

Here is revealed the motivating force behind Rome's pious outward regard for the conversion of souls.⁴ Obtaining mastery over the peoples' minds is a precursor to control of their purses.

Hard on the heels of Rome's consent to collude with Spain came the news of Mary Stuart's execution. New impetus was given to the preparation for the invasion. Now that the way had been opened to allow Philip direct access to the throne of England, he committed the entire resources of his empire to the building of a mighty fleet of ships - an "Invincible Armada". Hume tells us that the ports and isthmuses extending from Cape Finisterre in North Western Spain to Sicily were converted into a vast ship-building yard ("Hume", Vol. II, Chapter 42).

No doubt, the huge shipyards of Goa and lesser Portuguese ports in India and Ceylon also resounded to the sounds of axe and hammer on the magnificent teak timber used in the construction of the world's finest ships.

Plans for the invasion called for no less than one hundred and thirty vessels, great and small. Close tells us that the huge galleons were *"of great capacity and amazing strength. Their strong ribs were lined with planks four feet in thickness, through which it was thought impossible that cannon ball could pierce"*.

There were sixty-four of these huge, cumbersome galleons which towered like castles above the waves. Most were heavily armed with large brass cannon. Besides the normal complement of sailors, there was provision for quartering soldiers and even supplying comfortable quarters for the pope's spiritual army of

⁴ With the later defeat of the Spanish Armada, the Pope refused to pay a single ducat for an enterprise "that had accomplished nothing and was now at the bottom of the sea" (ibid p 102)

monks and friars.

Then there were the fearsome galleasses, the highly manoeuvrable destroyers capable of being speedily propelled by the oars of three hundred galley slaves, many of whom were serving sentences meted out by the pope's Inquisitors.

Built into the prow of these boats was a malevolent-looking espalone, tipped with a large iron spike for ramming and piercing the hulls of enemy ships. Armed with formidable cannon, they were the spearhead of the squadron which would grapple with the enemy, enabling their soldiers to swarm aboard, wreaking havoc with their swords and fearsome halberds (a combination of spear and battle axe).

Besides the eight thousand soldiers needed for this fearsome armada, there would be needed 2,088 galley slaves and 20,000 soldiers. But the spacious galleons could still provide ample room to adequately accommodate the numerous "noblemen and gentlemen" who were keen to obtain the pope's "blessing" by volunteering their services for the humbling of England.

But this was not all! To this, the greatest sea-borne invasion force ever assembled, was to be added yet another fleet! It was to be built and launched in the ports of the Netherlands by Philip's new governor of the Lowlands, the Duke of Parma, who was widely regarded as the *"ablest general of the age"*.

This second armada would consist of some four hundred vessels, large and small, which would meet up with the main armada as it lay off the coast at Calais. Not only would it reinforce the main fleet but it would be used for ferrying soldiers and supplies across the English Channel.

As the time for the invasion approached, Parma had assembled an impressive polyglot army in the Channel ports. Close gives some details revealing the divided loyalties of the times:

"There were thirty regiments of Italians, ten of Walloons, eight of Roman Catholic Scots and eight of Burgundians. Near Dixmuyde were mustered eighty regiments of Dutch, sixty of Spaniards, six of Germans, and seven of English fugitives under the command of Sir

William Stanley...quite a flock of Italian and Neapolitan princes and counts repaired to his [Parma's] banners. Believing that the last hour of England had come, they had assembled to witness her fall" ("The Defeat of the Spanish Armada", p 43).

Lest any of our readers be unconvinced of the papal component of this "holy" enterprise to finish "heretical" England, it is pertinent to note that the eventual complement of men included the Vicar-General of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, accompanied by two hundred Dominican Friars. As it was this Dominican Order that the Vatican had entrusted with the administration of the Inquisitions, it requires little imagination to realise what methods the pope had in mind for bringing about the "conversion" of English "heretics".

A look at the then contemporary city of Goa, in India, gives an insight into the terrible abominations committed in that Inquisition by the Dominican and Jesuit priests. It was set up in the year 1560 following the request of the Jesuit, Frances Xavier who, today, is lauded as a missionary and revered as a saint. As a result of the unspeakable atrocities committed in Goa, the St Thomas Christian Churches of Southern India were destroyed ere the century ended. (For information on the infamous Goa Inquisition and its role in the destruction of the St Thomas churches, read "The Inquisitive Christians" by H.H. Meyers).

Chapter Ten

The Armada Sails

In the merry month of May, 1588, Lisbon was agog with excitement. Now a part of greater Spain, this port had been selected for assembling the ships of Philip's "*Invincible Armada*". With the pope's promise of financial help, no money had been spared to ensure the success of this "holy" enterprise.

Pope Sixtus V had added his curse on the already "damned" Queen Elizabeth and now he placed his signal blessing on the fleet. The twelve principal ships of the armada received a papal baptism and each was christened with the name of an apostle. Others were named after saints.

On the 28th May, there arrived a favourable wind. The proud galleons spread their canvas and, with banners and streamers unfurled, proceeded to glide down the River Tagus in quest of their "holy" mission. We can well envisage the proud admiral, the Duke of Medina Sidonia, in the "St Martin", heading the seemingly endless procession. Nothing could stop them now and soon England would be humbled.

It seemed that every conceivable preparation and precaution had been taken to ensure the armada's success, even to commanding that "there shall be no sort of blasphemy on board the consecrated ships (C.S.P. (Spanish) 1 April, 1588, cited by Grierson, "*King of Two Worlds*", p 189).

But neither the pope, King Philip or Medina Sidonia had taken heed to the signs suggesting that their plans could be at variance with the divine programme. Already, the Spaniards had made a fatal mistake in building ships suited to the land-locked waters of the Mediterranean. Tall and cumbersome,

towering like lofty buildings tossing on the mighty Atlantic swells driven into the shallows of the English Channel, they would be no match for the shallower draft, faster and more manoeuvrable craft of England's hastily-collected navy.

Then, shortly before the armada was due to sail, there was the sudden death of the armada's appointed chief commander, the Marquis of Santa Cruz. He was beyond doubt Spain's ablest sea captain. So the ineffectual Medina Sidonia, whose chief recommendation was his wealth, was hastily appointed in his place.

Neither had there been concern for the fatal flaw in the strategic planning, except for the more discerning Parma. He had repeatedly warned Philip of the difficulties that could be expected in linking up his fleet with Medina Sidonia's at a pre-determined time. To add to the vagaries of the weather, there were treacherous tides and shoals to be negotiated with winds not always favourable to manoeuvring in the restricted waters of the Channel ports.

And then there were the pestilent Dutch seafarers. Who could guarantee that the rebellious Reformers would not support their fellow Protestants in England by blockading the Flanders ports, thereby preventing Parma's ships from reaching open waters?

But King Philip was so sure of his divinely-appointed mission and the efficacy of His Holiness's blessing, that he was able to shrug off Parma's forebodings.⁵ *"Great affairs involve great difficulties"*, summed up his philosophy which he had communicated to Parma in one of his replies.

⁵ Philip was not alone in his expectations. Dr Allen, now a Cardinal, had prepared a pamphlet titled, "An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England concerning the present wars". In essence, it was an exhortation to the Roman Catholics of England to rise up and join forces with those of the invading forces of his Catholic Majesty's forces. By purging the country of the iniquity of Elizabeth's reign, they would be assuring the salvation of their own and their children's souls. So confident was he of the Armada's success, that he had the pamphlets distributed when the Armada had sailed. (Garrett Mattingly, *"The Defeat of the Spanish Armada"*, pp. 324,325).

The incredible calamities contributing to the destruction of the "Invincible Armada" soon became a fact of history. All of Parma's forebodings were multiplied tenfold. The weather was unco-operative; the ships were unsuitable and the Dutch had successfully blocked the Flanders' ports. Tied to the order of strategy laid down by the "Catholic King", Medina Sidonia felt unable to react to changing circumstances. The ensuing delay proved disastrous for the waiting armada. It was while anchored off Calais that the Spaniards were introduced to England's innovative fire-ships. What England's Lord Howard and his nimble fleet failed to accomplish was finished off by the elements as surviving ships were driven northward along the Scottish coast. When the few battered survivors limped back to Spain some four months later, the enormity of the disaster became apparent. Spain had lost dominion of the seas.

Of the thirty thousand crusaders who had set out so confidently on the pope's service, less than ten thousand returned to their homes. King Philip was stunned and overwhelmed by the crushing blow. He closeted himself in his palace and refused audience with anyone. Far from receiving solace from his spiritual lord and master, Philip received a knockout blow inflicted on him by the pope who refused to pay even one ducat of his promised help! Philip's pleadings were in vain. Pope Sixtus V was not interested in honouring his pledge to a "loser", let alone paying for an armada that had achieved nothing and now lay at the bottom of the ocean.

The Christian world was not slow to see through the sham of papal infallibility. The blessing of the reputed Vicar of Christ had been shown to be worthless. Protestantism was elevated as the prestige of England and Holland rose, while that of Spain rapidly declined. The noon of the papacy waned while the high tide of the Spanish Empire began its protracted ebb.

The effect of the Spanish defeat on England, Scotland, the Netherlands and France was dramatic. Many who had wavered between Catholicism and Protestantism saw the folly of putting their trust in man and his traditions, as opposed to the Word of God.

Not the least of such was King James VI, son of Mary Queen of Scots, who in a few years' time was to become King James I of England, Ireland and France. As a champion of Protestantism, his name would become immortalised in the King James Version of the Bible.

Chapter Eleven

King James the Protestant

The dawn of the seventeenth century smiled benevolently on the British Isles. Flushed with the magnificent victory over Spain and the thwarting of papal designs, England settled into the role of leadership of the Reformation. But there remained one question mark which hung like a menacing cloud on the Protestant horizon. Would the successor to the aging Queen Elizabeth secure for England her Protestant way of life? Or would the machinations of the wily papists succeed once more in subjecting England to the whim and demands of a European monarch whose actions would be dictated by the rapacious aims of the papacy? The answer came in 1603. Within three days of Elizabeth's death, King James VI of Scotland became King James I of England and Ireland.

Although a Stuart (son of Mary Queen of Scots), James had increasingly leaned towards Protestantism. He had received most of his childhood education in England where he had come to be regarded as something of a prodigy due to his ability to read Latin and French, as well as being able to freely translate them into English. He later developed a remarkable knowledge of theology and became a skilled writer. Interestingly, he anticipated modern-day thought by writing "A Counterblast to Tobacco", described by the historian, C.H.K. Marten as "*a violent attack upon the practice of smoking*" ("The Groundwork of British History", p 327).

Such a man could not fail to appreciate the impact of the English Protestant Bibles on Scotland and England. "*Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free*" (John 8:32).

Free indeed were those countries which had grasped the basic tenet of the Reformation - that in matters of faith, the Bible was the only authority, and that Rome had never been the custodian of that authority!

It is not surprising then, that James was receptive to a petition from several hundred clergymen who requested an updated translation of the Bible and that this translation should continue in the tradition of the Byzantine, or Received Text, as used by Tyndale and that it should contain "no note or comment" (McClure, **"The Translators Revived"**, pp 57, 58 - cited by Wilkinson, **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 77).

This last requirement was a reaction to the copious explanations and notes found in the Jesuit Rheims New Testament for the purpose of supporting Roman tradition and dogma. The Jesuit Bible was particularly offensive to the stricter elements of Protestantism as found among the Puritans. Wilkinson sources Brooke for the following comment:

"The language of the Jesuit Bible had stung the sensibilities and the scholarship of Protestants. In the Preface of that book, it had criticised and belittled the Bible of the Protestants. The Puritans felt that the corrupted version of the Rheimists was spreading poison among the people, even as formerly by withholding the Bible, Rome had starved the people" (**"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 77).

It was also known that Allen's men at Douay were assiduously working on the translation of the Old Testament to complement the Rheims New Testament. What Rome could not do by force, she was determined to accomplish by taking captive the minds of men.

At this time, the English language had arrived at what many claim to be the apogee of expression. *"Each word was broad, simple and generic"* (Wilkinson). It was this language which such literary geniuses as Shakespeare and Bacon exploited to the full, leaving to us an English heritage which has not been surpassed. The time was ripe for Protestantism to bring forth a

Bible that would not only expose popish perversions but would become a monument to the English language and a treasure to all who cherish truth and liberty.

And who were better qualified for this awesome task than the godly scholars who were born and bred amidst the struggles of the Reformers? Their character had been refined by fire and shaped on the anvil of papal persecution. Surely none were better fitted to set about the task of transmitting the Word of God with conviction and sincerity!

King James responded to the call. He appointed fifty-four learned men, all with a reverent regard for divine inspiration to bring into being a Bible that would reflect the greatest possible concern to achieve fidelity of translation. By the time the work began, the number of translators had been reduced by circumstance and death to forty-seven.

Humility, the hallmark of every true follower of Christ, was not lacking in these great men. One of their number who was eventually appointed to write the Introduction to the finished Bible, Miles Smith, MA. D.D., was able to write:

"There were many chosen that were greater in the other men's eyes than in their own, and that sought the truth rather than their own praise" ("The Translators to the Reader").

The thoroughness with which these men were organised is well described by a modern-day admirer of the Authorised Bible - Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Ph.D.:

"The forty-seven learned men appointed by King James to accomplish this important task were divided first into three companies: one worked at Cambridge, another at Oxford, and the third at Westminster. Each of these companies again split up into two. Thus, there were six companies working on six allotted portions of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. Each member of each company working individually on his task, then brought to each member of his committee the work he had accomplished. The committee all together went over that

portion of the work translated. Thus, when one company had come together, and had agreed on what should stand, after having compared their work, as soon as they had completed any one of the sacred books, they sent it to each of the other companies to be critically reviewed. If a later company, upon reviewing the book, found anything doubtful or unsatisfactory, they noted such places, with their reasons, and sent it back to the company whence it came. If there should be disagreement, the matter was finally arranged at a general meeting of the chief persons of all the companies at the end of the work. It can be seen by this method that each part of the work was carefully gone over at least fourteen times. It was further understood that if there was any special difficulty or obscurity all the learned men of the land could be called upon by letter for their judgment. And finally, each bishop kept the clergy of his diocese notified concerning the progress of the work, so that if anyone felt constrained to send any particular observations, he was notified to do so" ⁶ ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", 1930, p 85).

The authorised Bible of King James became available to the public in 1611. Immediately it was accepted as the living Word of God and "*a miracle of English Prose*". A comparison with the Rheims-Douay Bible, the Old Testament portion of which was completed a couple of years earlier, only served to enhance the Authorised Version's popularity. It was immediately recognised as a death-blow to the supremacy of Roman Catholicism in the English-speaking world.

Faber, a one-time Church of England clergyman who, like many of his ilk, endeavoured to Romanise his church and

⁶ In stark contrast to such openness, we shall later note the secretive way in which the fraud of Revision was thrust upon the English-speaking world.

finally abandoned his Protestant cloak by embracing Roman Catholicism, was eminently qualified to identify Protestantism's great bulwark. He cried out in despair:

"The printing of the English Bible has proved to be by far the mightiest barrier ever reared to repel the advance of Popery, and to damage all the resources of the Papacy" (Eadie, *"The English Bible"*, Vol.II, p 158 - cited in *"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"*, p 88).

A "mighty barrier" indeed! It has turned out to be an enduring bulwark against Atheism, Modernism, Liberalism and Catholicism. It travelled the broad waters of the British-ruled seas to lands both old and new where it has been translated into "a thousand tongues". It formed the basis of common law in countries which it civilised. It stimulated the minds of men who developed the Protestant work ethic and brought about the Industrial Revolution which built Western civilisation. In short, its illuminating rays took the world out of the Dark Ages of ignorance and superstition and pointed the way to the shining light of intellectual, civil and religious liberty.

Our Authorised Bible has withstood the attacks of scoffers, sceptics and self-styled scientists. It has been challenged by numerous "newer and better" translations, yet it has remained the standard to which succeeding translators aspire and by which all are judged. Its numeration of chapters and verses is slavishly copied by the great majority.

After three hundred years of use, the *"Ladies Home Journal"* of November 1921 confidently asserted:

"Now, as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who care to read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorised Version; all others are inferior."

Questions then, must inevitably arise: What do the Protestant Bibles of the Received Text line have that is lacking in others? Why did the world have to await the arrival of the "Waldensian Bibles" to break the Roman shackles which bound it to the Dark Ages? The answer is simple. They transmit the inspired word of God as opposed to those which are contaminated by the philosophy, interpretations and emendations of men.

To demonstrate this claim, we shall briefly divert our attention from the glorious march of the Authorised Bible of King James to that period of early Christianity when the church, along with its Scriptures, first came under attack - an attack which has been sustained in varying degrees of subtlety and intensity to this very day.

Section Two

Chapters Twelve to Fifteen

"My Words Shall Not Pass Away"

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand forever" (Isaiah 40:8).

Chapter Twelve

Seeds of Apostasy

St John, the apostle of Jesus Christ is believed to have passed away around 100 AD. Having outlived his fellow apostles, he was able to take an active part in collating their writings into what we now call the New Testament (Eusebius, "Ecclesiastical History", Book III Chapter 24).

So carefully were the writings which form the New Testament chosen, that no Christian Church Council dared to question what the early church had set aside as inspired Scripture until the convening of the papal Council of Trent in 1645 (Dean Stanley, "Essays on Church and State", p 136).

John foresaw that the fledgling Christian Church would come to be seen as an enemy of the pagans. Just as the Prince of Darkness had sought to destroy the Word Incarnate (John 1:14), so the Word of Inspiration would surely come under attack. Therefore, before concluding his Revelation of Jesus Christ, John recorded one of God's most terrible warnings to mankind:

"If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city" (Revelation 22:18, 19).

The evil philosophies issuing from pagan countries at the commencement of the Christian era were numerous. Because they contrasted greatly with the quality of love which God had so dramatically demonstrated by sacrificing His *"only begotten*

Son" that all who truly believe might have eternal life (John 3:16; 1 John 5:13), the pagan religions could not compete with Christianity. Therefore, the Arch-deceiver needed to come up with a counterfeit Christianity which in reality was a modified form of paganism. This "Christianity" would play on the people's ignorance and present a pleasing alternative to those un-regenerated hearts which found the Christian demands of obedience to God's Law irksome.

Dr. B.G. Wilkinson, in his comprehensive work: **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, notes three warnings given by the apostle Paul as to what the Christian Church could expect:

1. "False Knowledge Exalted Above Scripture"

Paul warns of the intrusion into Scripture of *"science falsely so called"* (1 Timothy 6:20). Wilkinson reminds us that the Greek word used by Paul for science is "gnosis", which means "knowledge". He notes that the apostle did not condemn knowledge, but "false knowledge" and comments:

"False teachers were placing their own interpretations on Christian truth by reading into it human ideas. This tendency grew and increased until a great system, bearing the name of Christianity, known as "Gnosticism" was established" (**"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 8).

Wilkinson backs his argument by quoting Milman:

"The later Gnostics were bolder, but more consistent innovators on the simple theme of Christianity" (**"History of Christianity"**, Vol. II p 107).

2. "Spiritualising the Scriptures Away"

This phase of the apostasy was foretold in Paul's letter to Timothy:

"But shun profane babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker ... saying that the resurrection is passed already; and overthrow the faith of some" (2 Timothy

2:16-18).

Wilkinson comments thus:

"The prediction of the apostle was fulfilled in a great system of Bible spiritualising or mystifying which subverted the primitive faith. Turning the Scriptures into an allegory was a fashion in those days" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 11).

3. "Substituting Philosophy for Scripture"

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Colossians 2:8).

Celebrated historian Harnack supports Wilkinson's view:

"Greek philosophy exercised the greatest influence not only on the Christian mode of thought, but also through the institutions of the Church" ("History of Dogma", Vol. I p 128).

So it is quite clear that the real enemy of Christianity was not the obvious threat of heathenism or paganism, but the more subtle adulteration of Christianity. As we progress through this book we shall see that the above methods of perversion have been incorporated into the spurious renditions of Scripture which remain to this day in various modern versions - namely, Gnosticism, allegorising and Greek philosophising.

We know that this process of Scriptural depravation commenced even during the lifetime of some of the apostles and that the purpose was to destroy the fledgling church:

"Even before the death of the apostles, there was a strong disposition on the part of the great outlying world to destroy the new religion" (Hurst, "History of the Christian Church", Vol. I p 149).

Then we are told:

"The attack on Christianity dealt largely with the

Scriptures" (ibid p 187).

Writing of the Gnostic Marcion, Irenaeus shows how the attack continued into the second century:

"Wherefore also Marcion and his followers have betaken themselves to mutilating the Scriptures, not acknowledging some books at all; and, curtailing the Gospel according to Luke and the epistle of Paul, they assert that these alone are authentic, which they themselves have shortened" ("Anti-Nicene Fathers", [Scribners] Vol. I pp 434, 435).

Justin Martyr was born in Greece of pagan parents in the very year in which John the Revelator is thought to have died (100 AD). He is credited with conversion to Christianity and became a Christian teacher, but could not entirely divest himself of his heathen upbringing and so he clung to some heretical ideas.

One of his pupils was the famed Tatian, who built upon the heresies of his teacher by embracing Gnostic philosophy. He wrote what is known as the Diatessaron meaning "four in one", which he claimed harmonised with the Gospels. But they were so severely corrupted that a Bishop of Syria was astonished to find some of his parishioners actually coming to believe in them as though they were genuine Scriptures. He was so alarmed that he threw out some two hundred copies! ("Encyclopedias", "Tatian").

As the way of pupils who emulate their mentors, one of Justin Martyr's pupils who came to be known as Clemens of Alexandria, did just that. In his college which he founded, he determined that he would not teach true Christianity, but would mix it with pagan philosophy. Commenting on this J.W. Burgon, DD says:

"He [Clemens] habitually mistakes apocryphal writings for inspired Scriptures" Burgon attributes Clemens' careless attitude toward Scripture to his familiarity with the works of *"Marcion and the rest of the Gnostic crew"* ("Revision Revised", p 336).

Naturally, such teachings continued to be reflected in following generations. One of Clemens' pupils, Origen, had a penchant for allegorising the Scriptures to the extent that he came to the place where he could say:

"The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written" (**McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia**, article: "Origen").

With such observations, one is led to ponder just what use for Scripture Origen had in mind. Certainly it was not what the Author of Scripture intended, for had not God said:

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Timothy 3:16, 17).

It can readily be seen that Clemens' philosophy would enable the Scriptures to be interpreted to support practically any belief or dogma capable of being devised by man. Thus Origen came up with the notion that the soul existed from eternity. After death, it migrated to another form of life commensurate with one's conduct during the human life span (shades of Buddhism!). His fantasies led him to believe that even the stars and planets had souls which, like men, were on trial to learn perfection. (**"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 18).

So we see a new type of Bible emerging which Wilkinson describes as *"an adaptation of the Word of God to Gnosticism"*.

The learned Dr. Scrivener summed up the effect of this tragic prostitution of God's Word, when he wrote some sixteen centuries after Clemens:

"It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus (AD 150), and the African fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion

of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus" ("Introduction to New Testament Criticism", 3rd Edition p 511).

We shall now proceed to follow the early Christian Church and see how Origenism came to flood the emerging Roman Catholic Church through Eusebius and Jerome in the fourth century; and how that very distinguished Catholic theologian of the mid-nineteenth century, Cardinal Newman, was able to show what a powerful hold Origen still held over the philosophy of Catholicism:

"I love ... the name Origen. I will not listen to the notion that so great a soul was lost" (Newman, "Apologia pro vita sua", Chapter VII, 3rd Edition p 282).

Chapter Thirteen

Early Christian Missionaries

It is easy for present-day Christians to forget that the first Christians, as with Jesus and His disciples, were Jews. With the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD there was a great migration to Syria, including the area around Antioch where the followers of Christ were first called "Christians".

The writings of the apostles, which were in Koine Greek (or the common language of the day), were carefully collected and taken to Antioch where they were translated into Syriac about the year 150 AD. This translation came to be known as the Peshitta, or common language Bible (See Hort, "Introduction", p 143).

Copies of this Bible were eagerly sought by the expanding Syrian Church and were taken by its missionaries eastward into Persia, India and even into China!

But there was also a great need for a Latin translation, for it must be remembered that at the time, the Roman Empire included Asia Minor (now the Western portion of Turkey), Greece, Italy, Southern Europe and parts of Britain. Paul and Barnabas had already introduced Christianity to the Jews and the pagans of Galatia, which was then a Roman province.

The Galatians were descendants of a fiery Celtic race of Gauls who occupied an area in what is now known as France. They had subdued Italy over four centuries earlier, and then, being driven out by the emerging Roman Empire, had remained isolated in Asia Minor. Hence the name "Galatia" (Ridgeway, "The Early Age of Greece", Vol. I p 356).

The Galatians still maintained links with the Gauls and

although they used the Latin language of the Roman Empire, they also retained their Gallic language. They were ideally suited to take Christianity westward. To suit their needs the Koine Greek manuscripts from which the Peshitta originated, were translated into Latin in 157 AD. This was a forerunner of what came to be known as the Itala Bible. It was eventually carried westward by Celtic missionaries as far as Britain, for these people also had come to know Latin from their Roman conquerors.

It will be recalled that, after leaving Galatia, Paul continued his missionary journey to Greece. Such places as Athens, Philippi, Thessalonica and Corinth are inseparably connected with early New Testament history. The letters which Paul wrote to the believers were in Greek, so they had received much of the New Testament Canon first-hand. In God's providence, within the lifetime of the generation following the apostles, the civilised world had the benefit of the gospel recorded in Greek, Latin and Syriac languages.

In the middle of the third century, there was born in Antioch one who was to have a lasting influence on Christianity. His name was Lucian. Antioch by this time was a thriving Roman metropolis, but it was also a centre of Greek life and culture.

Perhaps more importantly, it had, by Lucian's time, superseded Jerusalem as the centre of Christianity. When he was about ten years of age, Lucian was brought face to face with the realities of imperial politics when Shapur I, the Persian Monarch, waged war against Rome and took the Emperor captive. Antioch now came under Persian rule. Many Syrian Christians were taken to Persia as captives and with them they took their Peshitta Bibles.

But it was not long before the Roman Empire was revitalised by an energetic Emperor named Aurelian. He regained most of the lost territories, including Antioch. By this time Lucian was a very well-educated man in his early twenties. Erelong, Roman and Alexandrian Bishops arrived, and began pressing their Romanised doctrines onto the Bishop of Antioch. Lucian noticed that the Scriptures which they used were substantially

different from those being used by Syrian Christians. Being a committed Christian in the apostolic tradition, he determined to resist the Gnostic philosophy that characterised these Bibles, and to reject the growing notion of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome who was exalting his position by using deceptive writings of an Apocryphal nature which supported the primacy of Peter (Source - Shotwell and Loumis, **"The See of Peter"**, p 122. Cited by Wilkinson in: **"Truth Triumphant"**, pp 49, 50).

Lucian was associated with the creation of a theological school in Antioch in which he taught and where he strove to protect the Apostolic Church from the inroads of heresy. Wilkinson cites Gilly, Fisher and Eusebius who tell us that in Lucian's day there

"Were at least eighty heretical sects all striving for supremacy" and that "Mutilations of the Sacred Scriptures abounded because each took unwarranted licence in removing or adding pages to the Bible manuscripts" ("Truth Triumphant", p 50).

As a counter to spurious Scriptures, Lucian determined to certify the Apostolic New Testament by editing the Peshitta and he also translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek. According to Nolan, this version held sway in Constantinople and in most of the East (**"The Integrity of the Greek Vulgate"**, p 72).

Thus we can attribute to this Christian scholar the honour of producing a complete Bible which established what has become known as the Traditional or Byzantine Text from which eventually came the Textus Receptus Bibles (Received Text) of the Protestant Reformation. (See the **"Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church"**, 1958 p 826).

Like so many of the following champions of the Traditional and Received Text, Lucian met a martyr's death in 312 AD.

Chapter Fourteen

Dividers of the Faith

The Christians of the early fourth century must have welcomed the news of Emperor Constantine's conversion to Christianity (circa 313 AD). For long and weary years, they had felt the oppressive heel of Diocletian, the pagan Roman Emperor, who used the forces of the State in a cruel but futile effort to crush their faith.

Did those Christians realise that Constantine's "conversion" was merely a political ploy to unite his Christian and pagan subjects under a form of government that espoused an acceptable mixture of their two philosophies? Where persecution had failed to check the spread of Christianity, it was thought that compromise would bring about peace and unity. Constantine looked around for a form of spiritual authority by which he could control the hearts and minds of both parties. What better authority than a Bible contaminated by Origen's penchant for allegorising Bible events or a Bible that could be interpreted to suit both pagan and Christian philosophies!

B.G. Wilkinson makes this interesting observation:

"His [Constantine's] predilection was for the type of Bible which readings would give him a basis for his imperialistic ideas of the great state church, with ritualistic orientation and unlimited central power. The philosophy of Origen was well suited to serve Constantine's religio-political theocracy" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", pp 19, 20).

It so happened that Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesarea, had recently (331 AD), edited Origen's Bible in the Greek. Constantine recognised his work as a fulfilment of his need. He ordered fifty copies to be produced on vellum (animal skins) and had them distributed among the churches around Constantinople. In so doing, it is pertinent to here note that, as Emperor Constantine had assumed the role of spiritual father of the Christian Church, he was in fact laying the foundation of the Roman Catholic system of religion, for the name itself is expressive of the union of a State and a Catholic, or universal church.

But not all Christians were prepared to accept Constantine's judgments on faith and order. Not the least of their objections centred on his Eusebio-Origen Bible which contrasted unfavourably with Lucian's Bible.

In an attempt to overcome this drawback, and in line with the desire of the emerging Roman Catholic Church to cut Western Europe off from Eastern culture and learning, Pope Damasus in 382 commissioned Jerome, one of his learned monks, to bring out a Bible translation in Latin.

Henceforth, the Greek language with its literary treasures was to be shunned by Rome, a fact which played no small part in bringing on the Dark Ages (476 - 1453).

Jerome had access to the famous library of Eusebius and Pamphilus in Caesarea where the many manuscripts of Origen were preserved (Swete, "Introduction to Greek Old Testament", p 86). In his book, "Catholic and Protestant Bibles", Jacobus tells us that among them was a Greek Bible of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus type (p 4). Jerome used this Bible as the basis of his Latin translation.⁷

However, Jerome didn't slavishly follow Eusebius. At that time, Lucian's (Traditional) Greek Bible held great sway around Constantinople, being much preferred to the Bible which Constantine had obtained from Eusebius. This was one reason

⁷ The Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus are considered to be survivors of the type of Bible ordered by Constantine (Price, "Ancestry" pp 69, 70).

why Rome was anxious for a Latin Bible. It could also help to wean the Latin speaking populous away from their Greek Bible. Jerome, according to Dr E.F. Hills, consulted old Greek manuscripts and Hills backs his conclusion by citing Hort:

"One of the Greek Manuscripts which Jerome used was closely related to Codex A, which is of the Traditional text type" (**"The King James Version Defended"**, p 187).

Dr Hills' own conclusions are similar:

"Among the Latin-speaking Christians of the West the substitution of Jerome's Latin Vulgate for the Old Latin Version may fairly be regarded as movement toward the Traditional (Byzantine) text type" (ibid).

Therefore, because Jerome's Bible came closer to the Traditional Text whilst still retaining much of Eusebius' Origenism, it was still highly acceptable to Rome as, what we today would call, an ecumenical Bible. Interestingly, Jerome did not want to include the apocryphal books in his Old Testament, yet at the insistence of the pope he was forced to include them.

Wilkinson sees this as proof that even at this early stage of development, the papacy upheld tradition as being of equal authority with Scripture (**"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 46).

Thus around 400 AD, Jerome gave to the Roman Catholic Church a Bible which has been used as a basis for its official Bible translations, eight of which have been produced to the middle of the twentieth century. Jerome's work did not readily gain acceptance with the masses and some nine hundred years were to pass before it came to be known as the Vulgate (Jacobus, **"Catholic and Protestant Bibles"**, p 4).

Such actions which secured for Rome much of the corrupted Origen-Eusebian Bible ensured that, henceforth, the Christian Church would never again be united. Three great branches of Christianity arose, each having its own Bible and liturgy. To

the east there was the original Apostolic Church which branched out from Greece and Syria and quickly spread into Persia, India and even into China and Japan. They came to rely on Lucian's Greek Vulgate and the Syriac Peshitta (Burton and Miller, **"The Traditional Text"**, p 128).

To the west there arose the great Latin communities of Northern Italy and the numerous Celtic communities of Christians who spread from Galatia into what is now France, and from there to England, Scotland and Ireland. These Christians took with them the Itala or Latin Bible which dates back to the mid-second century. Evidence for this is given by Fulton:

"The old Italic version into the rude Low Latin of the second century held its own as long as Latin continued to be the language of the people. The critical version of Jerome never displaced it, and only replaced it when the Latin ceased to be a living language, and became the language of the learned" ("Forum", June 1887, cited, "Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 27).

Milan, being strategically placed became a focal point of numerous Church Councils of the Eastern and Western clergy (See Gordon, **"World Healers"**, pp 210, 211, 237, 238).

The third great branch into which Christianity separated lay to the south, in the Roman portion of Italy and in North Africa, especially around Alexandria. It was this branch of Christianity which increasingly gorged itself on pagan philosophy and set up its religio-political headquarters in Rome. Its authority was a mixture of Jerome's Origen-impregnated Bible and the traditions of man. Its Bishop, the pope, declared himself head of all the Christian churches and set about imposing his leadership and corrupt Bible on the rest of Christianity. This battle of the Bibles, on which depends Roman Catholic supremacy in religion and politics, continues to this very day.

Chapter Fifteen

Keepers of the Faith

We shall now briefly trace the progress of the Bibles and Christianity in their march westward.

About the time that Jerome was engaged in translating and bringing out his Latin Bible there was in Ireland a young slave named Patrick who had been taken from "a land across the Irish Sea". he was born around 360 AD in the Northern Roman province of Strathclyde now known as Scotland. Patrick has left us an interesting record of his early life:

"I Patrick, a sinner, the rudest and least of all the faithful, and most contemptible to great numbers, had Calpurnius for my father, a deacon, son of the late Potitus, the presbyter who dwelt in the village of Banavan, Tiberniae, for he had a small farm at hand with the place where I was captured. I was then almost sixteen years of age. I did not know the true God; and was taken to Ireland in captivity with many thousand men in accordance with our desserts, because we walked at a distance from God and did not observe His commandments" ("Patrick's Confession", cited by Wilkinson, "Truth Triumphant", p 79).

But during his seven years of slavery, Patrick apparently learned obedience through suffering. He had plenty of time to contemplate his duty to the apostolic faith into which he was born. After escaping, he realised that his former captors, whom he had come to know and love in Ireland, themselves were slaves of paganism, and he was determined to return to the land

of his captivity as a missionary of Jesus Christ. It is thought that the time of his return to Ireland was around 390 AD (ibid p 82).

Patrick preached from the Bible with remarkable results. The Bible he used was of the Itala line. He set up Bible schools which later grew into colleges and large universities. These schools had no papal connections in that the Bible was their sole authority, neither did they give heed to papal decrees in respect to religious festivals, Sunday observance, and liturgy.

Well after Patrick's death, these schools continued to turn out famous students of the apostolic faith. There was Columba, who enthroned Christ in Scotland; Aidan, who turned England away from its pagan rituals; and Columbanus, with others following who Christianised Germany, France and Switzerland. The schools which they set up became great centres for disseminating their hand-written Bibles. These Bibles were beautifully copied as befitting the execution of a holy task:

"In delicacy of handling and minute but faultless execution, the whole range of palaeography offers nothing comparable to those early Irish manuscripts" (Tymms, **"The Art of Illuminating as Practiced in Europe From Earliest Times"**, p 15).

The historian Cathcart's comments indicate a very high degree of learning among these early Celtic missionaries:

"Columba possessed a superior education. He was familiar with Latin and Greek, secular and ecclesiastical history, the principles of jurisprudence, the law of nations, the science of medicine, the laws of the mind. He was the greatest Irishman of the Celtic race in mental powers; and he founded in Iona the most learned school in the British Islands, and probably in Western Europe for a long period" (Cathcart, **"The Ancient British and Irish Churches"**, p 185).

The indefatigable Columba is credited with establishing over three hundred churches, many of which had schools or

monasteries and some of these became centres for the copying of Scripture. Columba himself, is said to have with his own hand, transcribed some three hundred New Testaments. In his numerous writings and poems there is evidence that he used the Itala-type Bible (See Wilkinson, "Truth Triumphant", p 103).

It's highly significant that these and all other churches which revered the apostolic line of Bibles such as Itala, Peshitta and Lucian's Vulgate (as opposed to the Roman Bibles of Eusebius and Jerome), continued to keep the Biblical seventh-day Sabbath as a day of rest. The British Isles was no exception as shown in the following statements:

"The Celts used a Latin Bible [Itala] unlike the Vulgate [of Jerome] and kept Saturday as a day of rest" (Flick, "The Rise of the Medieval Church", p 237).

"Having continued his labours in Scotland thirty-four years, he [Columba] clearly and openly foretold his death, and on Saturday, the ninth of June, said to his disciple Diermit: "This day is called the Sabbath, that is, the day of rest, and such will it truly be to me; for it will put an end to my labours" (Butler, "Lives of the Saints", Vol. 6 p 139).

The Historian Andrew Lang confirms the practice of Sabbath-keeping among the Celtic Churches:

"They worked on Sunday, but kept Saturday in a sabbatical manner" (Lang, "A History of Scotland", Vol. 1 p 96).⁸

⁸ Thinking readers may be perplexed at the thought of two of Rome's proclaimed saints observing the Biblical seventh-day Sabbath [Saturday]. But the sobering facts are that neither Patrick, Columba or the Celtic Churches in general, had any connection with the Bishop of Rome. Wm. Cathcart DD says: There is strong evidence that Patrick had no Roman commission in Ireland. As Patrick's churches in Ireland, like their brethren in Britain repudiated the supremacy of the popes, all knowledge of conversion of Ireland through his ministry must be suppressed [by Rome at all costs]" ("The Ancient British and Irish Churches" p 85).

As an adjunct to the footnote on the previous page, it's worthy to note B.G. Wilkinson's astute observation:

"One is struck by the absence of any reference to Patrick in "The Ecclesiastical History of England" written by that fervent follower of the Vatican the Englishman Bede, who lived about two-hundred years after the death of the apostle to Ireland ... The reason apparently is that, when this historian wrote, the papacy had not yet made up its mind to claim Patrick" ("Truth Triumphant", p 88).

Perhaps no other name is more famous in the history of the Apostolic Church's fight against the doctrines and dogma of the papacy than that of the Waldenses. Writers sympathetic to the papacy have attempted to fix their origins to the time of Peter Waldo of the late twelfth century. At the very best, this is a mistake, if not deliberate fraud. Wilkinson reminds us that:

"The historical name of this people as properly derived from the valleys where they lived, is Vaudois" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 34).

He then proves his point:

"There remains to us in the ancient Waldensian language, "The Noble Lesson" (La Nobla Leycon), written about the year 1100 AD, which assigns the first opposition of the Waldenses to the Church of Rome to the days of Constantine the Great when Sylvester was Pope" (ibid pp 34, 35).

Prior to seeking asylum in the Piedmont valleys of Northern Italy due to the increasing hostility of the papacy, the Waldenses were part of the Apostolic Church living around Milan. The reason for their falling out with Rome was due to their insistence that they follow the Bible as their rule of faith. As we have already seen, this Bible was Itala. Wilkinson refers to the historian Comba who makes this significant remark:

"It is held that the pre-Waldensian Christians of

northern Italy could not have had doctrines purer than Rome unless their Bible was purer than Rome's, that is, [their Bible] was not of Rome's falsified manuscripts" (ibid p 31).

(This axiomatic statement by Comba is equally valid today and should be remembered by every Protestant who bears the name seriously).

Helvidius is the name of a notable northern Italian scholar who opposed the emerging papal style of church practices. He had studied under Auxentius, Bishop of Milan, where the church prized its Itala Bible. It contrasted with those being used by Rome, which would include the Greek Bible edited for Constantine by Eusebius. Helvidius publicly challenged the Catholic, Jerome, for using corrupt Greek manuscripts. It was such criticism of Constantine's Eusebius Greek Bible by eminent scholars that had prodded Jerome into caution. So, as we have seen, instead of just translating Eusebius' Bible from the Greek into Latin, he also sought out early Greek manuscripts and ended up with a Bible that was much closer to the Itala, or Traditional Text, yet, importantly, it still retained many corruptions.

It is important to remember the influence which these godly Waldensian scholars had on Jerome, for his Bible became the authorised Latin Vulgate which the Church of Rome authenticated at the Council of Trent. This explains why its progeny the Douay Bible, is closer to the King James Version than most later modern versions which have virtually reverted to the text-type used by Eusebius. We shall enlarge on this phenomenon in section four.

Jovinianus, a learned compatriot of Helvidius, offended Jerome and his followers by his superior scholarship and his condemnation of the heathen superstitions which Jerome nurtured and practiced; for Jerome encouraged an ascetic form of worship which resulted in the pagan monasticism practiced by the priests and other Roman religionists to this day (See Gilly, "**Vigilantius and His Time**", p 246).

Public proceedings were instituted against Jovinianus in Rome and Milan and, according to A.H. Newman, this forced Jovinianis and his fellow believers to seek refuge in the Alpine Valleys [among the Vaudois or Waldenses] ("**A Manual of Church History**", Vol. I p 376).

The evidence of history compels us to agree with Wilkinson's conclusions regarding the Waldenses and their Bible:

"Thus when Christianity emerging from the long persecutions of pagan Rome, was raised to imperial favour by the Emperor Constantine, the Italic Church in northern Italy - later the Waldenses - is seen standing in opposition to papal Rome. Their Bible was of the family of the renowned Itala. It was that translation into Latin which represents the Received Text. Its very name "Itala" is derived from the Italic district, the regions of the Vaudois" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 35).

As to the purity of the Waldenses' Bible in relation to its contemporaries, let us hear from Rome's acclaimed authority, Augustine, to whom the Catholic Church loves to pay saintly homage. Around 400 AD he said:

"Now among translations themselves the Italian [Itala] is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression" ("Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers", [Christian Lit Edition] Vol. II p 542 - cited by Wilkinson) (ibid).

(Let the reader take heed to the importance of this eulogy coming as it does from one of Rome's revered fathers. In contrast we can only marvel at the contempt and hatred later generated by Rome against the Bible which Augustine so justly acclaimed).

Dr Scrivener confirms the antiquity of the Waldensian's Itala Bible:

"The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek no later than 157 AD" ("Scrivener's

Introduction", Vol. II p 43).

It is difficult to imagine any Bibles being closer to the apostle's autographs than the Peshitta and the Itala for the translators of these Bibles could very well have been born during the lifetime of some of Christ's disciples. It is also reasonably assumed that John, in his final years, assisted in collating the books of the New Testament Canon (Eusebius, "Ecclesiastical History", Book III Chapter 24).

Therefore, Christians can be confident that when they read from the King James Version of the New Testament, or any other language translation of the Received Text, they are indeed reading the Word of God, for its pedigree goes right back to apostolic times. Truly we can endorse the sentiments of one of the world's most respected Christian commentators:

"The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures ... They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution ... Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith ... But in a most wonderful manner it [God's Word] was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness" (White, "The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan", pp 65, 66, 69).

How could things have been any different! Had not Jesus Christ promised: *"My words shall not pass away"*? (Matthew 24:35).

(For a dramatic account of the way in which the Syriac Bible was preserved in isolation in India throughout the period of the Dark Ages, the author recommends his book, "The Inquisitive Christians", available from "New Millennium Publications" P.O. Box 290, Morisset, NSW. 2264, Australia).

Section Three

Chapters Sixteen to Twenty-Four

War on the King James Bible

"The English (as well as the Greek) of the newly 'Revised Version' is hopelessly at fault....

"It is however, the systematic depravation of the underlying Greek which does so grievously offend me: for this is nothing else but a poisoning of the River of Life at its sacred source" (Dean Burgon, "The Revision Revised", Dedication, p VI).

Chapter Sixteen

Higher Criticism-Enemy of the Reformation

Having briefly traced the development of the diverging streams of Scripture in the setting of early Christianity, we can appreciate, at least to some extent, the great disparity between the Bible which instigated and later consolidated the Protestant Reformation, and Jerome's Latin Bible which Rome calls the Vulgate. It was by this latter Bible that Rome sought to control the religious and political destinies of men as instanced during the Dark Ages and later through its progeny the Douay Bible with which she sought to stem the Reformation tide.

With the failure of the Rheims-Douay Bible to impress the English-speaking world, the Authorised Bible of King James remained supreme. Its success was faithfully mirrored in the prosperity of the countries which were later to emerge as the British Empire, the state churches of England and Scotland, and the numerous non-conformist Protestant churches which derived their beliefs from the study of an open Bible. But even as the Reformation was prospering in the English-speaking world, its decay continued elsewhere, especially in France and Germany. There, the Reformation was rapidly drowning in the rising tide of modernism and "higher criticism" of the Bible.

If Rome could not succeed in replacing the Protestant Bible with her own, her new tactic was to cause the Protestants to lose confidence and faith in their Bible. This is what "higher criticism" is all about.

One of the earliest contributors to the art of critical enquiry was a French scholar, Richard Simon. The Catholic Encyclopedia proudly confers on him the title of "*Father of*

Biblical Criticism" (Vol. IV pp 492, 493). Between the years 1689 and 1695 he continued to attack God's Word by publishing a series of commentaries on the New Testament text. Needless to say, he was partial to the text used by the Jesuit translators of the Rheims-Douay Bible, an Anglicanised version of the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. His discrediting of the Received Text line of Bibles opened the flood-gates of doubt on the very foundation of Protestantism as numerous critics broached theories and conjectures which tore various parts of the Bible to shreds - especially those parts dealing with the supernatural.

(By the late nineteenth century, these contaminating theories were to bear poisonous fruit as demonstrated in the efforts of two traitorous Anglican clergymen, Drs Westcott and Hort. Their hatred of the Received Text and the lasting effects of their Roman-inspired attack on the King James Bible will be discussed at length in chapter eighteen).

Not surprisingly, this climate of doubt and questioning gradually led to a general loss of faith in Christianity, and in France there arose a savage back-lash against the organisers of the debacle. In 1773, the Jesuit Order or Society of Jesus was banned. This action was merely a precursor to the impending bloody French Revolution which occurred sixteen years later.

During the following quarter-century, the revolutionary armies of Napoleon rampaged over Europe in an orgy of antireligious conquests which were seen by some as *"The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit"* (Revelation 11:7).

Even the pope was dethroned and Christianity, especially as practised by the Roman Catholic Church, appeared to have received a mortal blow. Careful students of prophecy realised that they were watching the fulfilment of prophecy where the Beast of Revelation was *"wounded to death"* (13:3).

Had these same students studied with more understanding, they would have noticed that the *"deadly wound"* was later to be *"healed"* (Verse 12).

After the overthrow of Napoleon in 1812, in which the British played no small part, there emerged a confused and changed

Europe. In France we find the pope's faithful lackeys - the Bourbons - being rapidly restored to power and the reinstatement of the previously banned Jesuits.

Although England had escaped the upheavals of the revolution, plans were rapidly set in place to educate Englishmen in European Catholic seminaries in order that they might re-enter Britain as theological warriors of Rome. Many of these were clerics who had been trained in the Church of England's newly acquired tradition at Cambridge and Oxford. One such person was Nicholas P.S. Wiseman who went to Rome ostensibly to undertake Oriental studies, yet incredibly, he returned to England as an "expert" in textual criticism! His theories which denigrated the Received Text, and consequently the Authorised King James Bible, were avidly adopted by scholars whose names have since become synonymous as revisionists, not only of the Authorised Version, but of Anglicanism itself.

However, we are indebted to Wiseman for revealing the true source of his theories which actually came from his close association with Jesuits. In later life he was to admit:

"Without this training I should not have thrown myself into the Puseyite Controversy at a later date" (Ward, *"Life and Times of Wiseman"*, Vol. I p 65).

(The Puseyite Controversy here mentioned refers to the activities of Dr Pusey who took Newman's place in the Oxford Movement). Not surprisingly, Wiseman soon openly defected to Romanism and was later rewarded with a Cardinal's hat.

Another of Dr Wiseman's contemporaries, John H. Newman of Oxford, also defected to Roman Catholicism after going to Rome and exposing himself to the poison of the papal bug.

In order that the reader might gain an insight into this era of papal intrigue and subversion of English clerics, we shall devote the following chapter to a more detailed account of Newman's fatal attraction to the ritualism and traditions of Rome. His story will graphically illustrate the importance which Rome attaches to displacing Bibles of the Received Text and

how Newman and his kind, established in Anglicanism's main theological college a malignant virus which soon grew into what is known as the Oxford Movement, also known as Tractarianism.⁹

⁹ The Movement published ninety "Tracts for the Times" (1833-1841). As well as writing twenty-four of them Newman edited the entire series. ("Encyclopedia Britannica" 1986 Vol IX p 30).

Chapter Seventeen

Kindly Light or Searing Flame?

*"Lead Kindly Light amid the encircling gloom,
Lead thou me on!
The night is dark and I am far from home;
Lead thou me on."*

Countless numbers of Christians have sung these stirring words penned by Church of England clergyman Dr John H. Newman. No doubt many have drawn from them strength and courage in their resolve to follow their Master.

But it is quite unlikely that many would attach to them the sentiments which inspired the author of this famous hymn.

In the year 1833, Newman was returning to England by ship, following a visit to Rome. There, he and his compatriot and companion, Herrell Froude had fallen under the bewitching spell of the "city of celestial traditions". As he stood on deck, gazing out into the blackness of a Mediterranean night, his thoughts wandered back to his Protestant upbringing. He now realised that

"The superstitions of his youth, that Rome was the 'Beast' which stamped its image on mankind, the 'Great harlot' who made drunk the kings of the earth, were dispelled" (Cadman, "Three Religious Leaders", p 496).

So enthralled by the pomp and splendour of the papacy were these two Oxford professors, that they were presumptuously led to inquire of the papal prelates as to the terms on which the Church of Rome would receive the Church of England back

into her bosom.

"The answer came straight and clear, without any equivocation - the Church of England must accept the Council of Trent" (Wilkinson, "Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 128).

Both Newman and Froude were very much aware of the first four resolutions adopted by the Council of Trent back in the mid sixteenth century. These had to do with papal authority in relation to the Bible. Briefly stated, the resolutions claimed that:

1. *Papal tradition was on level with Scripture.*
2. *The Apocryphal books were equal with the Canonical.*
3. *The Roman Vulgate Bible contained no errors.*
4. *Only the Roman Catholic clergy had the right to interpret Holy Writ.*

And, when the papacy referred to "Holy Writ" it was not talking about the Authorised Bible of the Church of England. No, No! It had scornfully been dubbed: *"The Protestant's paper pope"*, for it had become Britain's rule of life and had overthrown the authority of papal tradition.

Newman loved tradition and ritualism. As for the Bible, well, he had already imbibed so much of Origen's philosophy that he looked upon it largely as allegory; hence it needed tradition to be its interpreter. And who were the custodians of tradition? Were they not the fathers of the Roman Catholic Church?

A sudden lurch of the ship caused Newman to grasp the handrail:

*"Keep thou my feet, I do not ask to see
The distant scene;
One step enough for me."*

Newman's mind was made up. Within five days of arriving back in England in July 1833 he took that "step" by initiating what later became known as "The Oxford Movement". It eventually led him to openly embrace Catholicism and become

a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Oxford University was the logical place for an assault on Protestantism for this institution had become the bastion and backbone of the Church of England. While a student at Oxford, he and others of his friends had fallen under the spell of Jesuit influences from Germany and France. Froude's father was a High Churchman *"who loathed Protestantism and denounced Evangelicals and brought up his son to do the same"* (Cadman, **"Three Religious Leaders"**, p 459).

Newman's early fond attachment to his friend Froude had become so great that later,

"Following the early death of his friend, he wrote endearing verses to his memory ... Newman himself had chosen the celibate life, and no doubt Froude's passionate tendency towards Romanism answered in Newman's breast those social yearnings which men usually satisfy in married life" (Wilkinson, **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 127).

It is not surprising then, that with such a friendship, Newman's infatuation with ritualism and formalism should be bolstered by Froude's hatred of Protestantism. Dr Wilkinson tells how they attracted to their cause many Oxonians who banded themselves together with

"Aggressive determination to attack weak points wherever they could make their presence felt by precipitating crises in the control of the University.... They grouped round them the students of the University and changed the course of Oxford thinking. They published a series of tracts which threw a flood of fermenting thought upon the English mentality By voice and pen, the teaching of Newman changed in the minds of many their attitude toward the Bible. Stanley shows us that the allegorising of German theology under whose influence Newman and the leaders of the movement were, was Origen's method of allegorising. Newman contended that God never intended the Bible to

teach doctrines. Much of the church history read, was on the Waldenses and how they had through the centuries from the days of the apostles, transmitted to us the true faith. The Tractarians determined that the credit of handing down truth through the centuries, should be turned from the Waldenses to the Papacy ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", pp 130, 131).

Thus the work of subverting Protestant England through its own institutions continued in many forms and many areas. Another imposter who became a notable Romaniser was Dr Pusey. He

"Scandalised some of the less ardent spirits by visiting the Catholic monasteries in Ireland to study monastic life, with a view to introducing it into England" (ibid p 131. See Walsh, "Secret History", p 282).

Perhaps it was because of the growing influence and success of the Puseyites that Dr Newman felt that the time had come when he could take another "step" by discarding his role as a traitor and come out into the open to embrace Roman Catholicism. Wilkinson describes the scene:

"On the night of October 8, [1845], Father Dominic of the Italian Passionists arrived at Newman's quarters in a downpouring rain. After being received, he was standing before the fire drying his wet garments. He turned around to see Newman prostrate at his feet, begging his blessing, and asking him to hear his confession" (ibid p 135).

Newman, the traitor had indeed arrived "home" where he belonged, and the mantle of leadership now fell on Pusey's shoulders. From now on, the Church of England rapidly took on a ritualistic form of service:

"The passion to introduce the Mass, the confession, the burning of candles, holy water, the blessing of oils, and all other gorgeous accompaniments of Catholic

ritualism went forward so strongly that the movement since 1845 is known rather under the name of Ritualism" (**"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 136).

The ritualistic climate was very favourable to the spread of Catholicism. According to Ward, during the period from 1830 to 1863 the number of priests in England alone increased from 434 to 1242! During this time, the convents increased from a mere sixteen to one-hundred and sixty-two! (**"Life of Wiseman"**, Vol. II p 459).

And now came the opening salvo of the expected attack on the Authorised Bible of King James. In 1860 there appeared a series of essays by prominent Church of England clergymen against such vital Protestant doctrines as "the inspiration of the Bible" and "justification by faith"; also the Protestant stand against purgatory was attacked.

Dr Fenton J.A. Hort was invited to contribute to the attack on the Scriptures but he declined - probably because he was already secretly engaged with Bishop Brooke F. Westcott in translating their Greek New Testament from the corrupted Alexandrian manuscripts of Rome. He realised that without a Catholic slanted English Bible any attempt to refute Protestantism in England was premature and likely to fail.

In recognition of the role which the Received Text had played in the success of the Protestant Reformation, the Roman Catholics and their sympathisers displayed bitter hostility towards the King James Bible. Dr Faber, a passionate Romaniser and associate of Newman, referred to the King James Bible as *"That stronghold of heresy in England"* and Newman claimed that it could not be a true comment on the original text as it was made and authorised by *"Royal commands"* (Newman, **"Tract 90"**).

Soon after declaring himself a Roman Catholic, Newman was invited to return to Rome. The Vatican had concluded that Newman could be entrusted with the task of bringing about the demise of the King James Bible, disparagingly referred to by

the papists as: *"The paper Pope of the Protestants"* (Von Dobschutz, *"The Influence of the Bible"* p 136)

In a letter written from Rome to his compatriot Wiseman, dated January 17, 1847 Newman, disclosed some details of his mission to Rome:

"The Superior of the Franciscans, Father Benigno, in the Trastevere, wished us out of his own head to engage in an English Authorised Translation of the Bible. He is a learned man, and on the Congregation of the Index.¹⁰ What he wished was, that we would take the Protestant translation, correct it by the Vulgate ... and get it sanctioned here. This might be our first work if you Lordship approved of it. If we undertook it, I should try to get a number of persons at work (not merely our own party). First, it should be overseen and corrected by ourselves, then it should go to a few select revisers, eg. Dr Tait of Ushaw, Dr Whitty of St Edmunds, (a Jesuit)" (Ward, *"Life of Wiseman"*, Vol. I p 454 - Cited in *"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"*, p 147).

It is very important that the significance of Ward's documentation be noted. Here is a traitor to Anglicanism confiding instructions from the Congregation of the Papal Index to another English traitor. Note that the King James Version had obviously been condemned, banned and damned by the Congregation of the Index and that all concerned were aware of the vital importance of the King James Version to Protestantism and therefore, the necessity to nullify it. To achieve this goal, it should be "corrected" by the Latin Vulgate by a group of Catholics and non-Catholics under the supervision of both Wiseman and Newman, and then be finally reviewed by Catholic scholars, one of whom was a Jesuit by the name of Whitty. Patently, the inclusion of non-Catholics was simply a

¹⁰ The Index is a list of books or writings prohibited by the papacy. Obviously, this included the Protestant Bible.

farcical ploy to make it appear a Protestant initiated effort to produce an authorised update of the King James Version.

But such a deception was more easily proposed than carried out. In order for the plan to succeed, important, time-consuming ground work needed to be put in place. First, a whole generation of theological students at Oxford and Cambridge, as well as influential clergy, must become sympathetic to Romanism with its ritualistic forms of worship. Such subverters would need the moral support of a revitalised Roman hierarchy in Britain.

In 1850 the pope had invested Wiseman with the princely title of Cardinal and appointed him Archbishop of Westminster. He soon established a chain of command throughout England consisting of twelve Catholic bishoprics through which Roman philosophy and religion could now be broadcast.

A measure of the hostility to this increased Roman activity can be gauged by Protestant reaction in Salisbury, where effigies of the pope, Wiseman and the twelve bishops were paraded and then burned. Ward describes the scene:

"Castle Street was so densely crowded that no one could pass to the upper part of it. Shortly after, some hundreds of torches were lighted which then exhibited a forrest of heads ... The effigies were taken to the Green croft where, over a large number of faggots and barrels of tar, a huge platform was erected of timber; the effigies were placed thereon, and a volley of rockets sent up" ("Life of Wiseman", Vol. I pp 551, 552).

Such outbursts only emphasised the need for further caution and more preparation on the part of the Romanists.

By this time, Anglican clergymen were being caught up in a new type of theology engendered by a terrific barrage of German Biblical Criticism. Many tracts appeared containing essays and reviews attacking the Protestant position on the inspiration of the Bible, justification by faith and Protestant objections to Roman dogma, such as purgatory and the Mass.

As an example of the tremendous turn-around taking place in

the Protestant clergy. B. G. Wilkinson cites the case of a Protestant writer:

"One of these essays was written by Professor H.B. Wilson, who earlier had denounced Newman's "Tract 90" for its views on the Thirty-nine Articles [of the Church of England]. Twenty years later, however, he argued in favour of the very views which he had denounced previously" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 140).

In his "Tract 90", Newman had also portrayed the King James Bible as a spurious text, devoid of divine authority, having been authorised by royal command and he contrasted it with the Catholic Vulgate which was *"A true comment on the original text"*.

Of the many Anglican clerics who had been influenced by the bombardment of pro-Catholic writings emanating from the Newman-led Oxford Tractarians, there are two names which stand out as examples of the success attending the efforts of the ex-Anglicans, Cardinals Wiseman and Newman. They are the Oxford trained Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort.

As these two men were shortly to emerge as the leading players in Rome's plan to destroy the authority of the King James Bible we shall dwell a little on their background.

At the age of twenty-two, Westcott revealed his doubts on the inspiration of Scripture. In a letter to his fiancée, dated Advent Sunday, 1847 he wrote:

"The battle of the inspiration of Scripture has yet to be fought, and how earnestly I pray that I might aid the truth in that" ("Life of Westcott", Vol. I p 95).

In the same year, he wrote from France to his fiancée disclosing his fascination for the Catholic doctrine of Mary-worship:

"After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a

neighbouring hill ... It is very small; with one kneeling place; and behind a screen was a "Pieta", the size of life. [The Virgin holding the dead Christ in her lap] ... I could have knelt there for hours" (ibid Vol. I p 81).

Eighteen years later he divulged his pre-occupation with the mystery of Mariolitary when he wrote to Archbishop Benson:

"I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolitary bears witness" (ibid Vol. I p 251).

About this time, his compatriot Hort, revealed his affinity with Westcott, and his deplorable lack of understanding of the plan of salvation:

I have been persuaded for many years that Mary worship and 'Jesus' worship have very much in common in their causes and results"

And, in 1867 Hort wrote to Dr Lightfoot confirming his penchant for the ritualistic worship of the priesthood:

"But you know I am a staunch sacerdotalist"¹¹ ("Life of Hort", vol II pp 49, 86).

Among Hort's subverted friends in the Anglican ministry we could mention a brilliant student of Oxford and Cambridge, Frederick Maurice. The son of a Unitarian minister, he had written books which Hort claimed *"Deeply influenced him"* (ibid p 155).

Because of his gross heresy, Maurice was eventually dismissed from his position as principal of Kings College, London. (The effects of this association with Unitarians will be apparent as we later note the composition of the committee appointed for the revision of the King James Version).

Hort's son claimed that his father had been profoundly impressed by Samuel Taylor Coleridge whose strange religious

¹¹ One who believes in the system of the priesthood

philosophy had been expressed in many of his writings. In discussing Coleridge, Hort wrote to Westcott in 1864:

"I believe Coleridge was quite right in saying that Christianity without a substantial church is vanity and disillusion; and I remember shocking you and Lightfoot not so long ago by expressing a belief that 'Protestantism' is only parenthetical and temporary" ("Life of Hort", Vol. II p 30).

Again he shows his affinity with Coleridge and his Higher Criticism when writing to John Ellerton:

"I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coleridge justly argues" ("Life of Hort", Vol. I p 78).

Hort's friend, Westcott, had no problem with such criticism. He wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1890:

No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did" ("Life of Westcott", Vol. II p 69).

One could go on reciting the aberrations of these men who drew their stipend from the Anglican Church. But, in terms of sheer hypocrisy, it would be hard to imagine a situation more morally bankrupt than the following citation of the proverbial "biting of the hand that feeds it". Hort wrote to Westcott in 1864:

"With that world Anglicanism, though by no means without a sound standing, seems a poor and maimed thing beside the great Rome" ("Life of Hort", Vol. II p 30).

Is it any wonder that these two Anglican traitors caught the

attention of other kindred spirits in the persons of the aforementioned apostates - Wiseman and Newman. With their co-operation, it would now be possible to have professing Protestants substitute the Latin Vulgate for the Protestant Bible and all this could be achieved under the guise of a Protestant-inspired revision!

It was quite apparent to most scholars that the Rheims-Douay Bible was a dead horse. One reason for its poor acceptance was due to its New Testament parentage - the Latin Vulgate. Therefore a new Greek Testament, to counter that of Erasmus's would provide an "authentic" source. With this plan in mind, back in 1853 Westcott and Hort had quietly started work on a Greek translation of the New Testament. That it should take twenty years to complete is indicative of the patience and dedication so often displayed by those who, like moths which exhibit a fatal fascination for a searing flame, respond to a seemingly irresistible urge to embrace and promote the hellish mysteries of Rome.

That the real purpose of this Greek translation of the New Testament remained hidden from all except a few trusted revisionists who quietly injected the Vulgate into the "Revision", is yet another indication of the stealth employed by Rome and her facile minions in order to achieve their subversive goals.

All that was needed now was a program of agitation for Bible revision. As we shall now see, the Oxford-led disciples of Newman and their followers were not backward in supplying it.

Chapter Eighteen

The Schemers

Unlike Erasmus, who had constructed his Greek New Testament from the Traditional Text line, as handed down from the apostles through the churches in the wilderness, Westcott and Hort went for Eusebius' Greek Bible. Jerome had replaced Eusebius' with a Bible in Latin.

Among the fifty copies of this Bible ordered by Constantine it is reasonably assumed two have survived to this day, simply because they were written on durable vellum and also because they fell into disuse when Jerome's Bible was adopted by Roman Catholicism some sixty year later (See **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 248).

Of these manuscripts, one has survived for centuries locked up in the recesses of the Vatican. There it remained in seclusion until "rediscovered" in 1844. Another survived the ravages of time, protected by the dry air of the Sinai desert. It was rediscovered in 1859 amongst the rubbish of the St Catherine Monastery at the foot of Mt Sinai. It had been tossed out by some monk who obviously regarded it as worthless junk.

These two Origen-impregnated manuscripts have been named Vaticanus (or B) and Sinaiticus (or "Aleph"). Westcott and Hort seized on these Greek New Testaments as a basis for their work for very good reasons. One is that the Origenism with which these manuscripts are impregnated, suited their modernist philosophy and ritualistic desires.

Another circumstance which Westcott and Hort could turn to their advantage was the fact that, although these manuscripts are believed to be two of the fifty commissioned by

Constantine, they were so corrupted that they differed significantly in over three thousand places in the Gospels alone!¹² So, by using an eclectic method, these two schemers could choose from either manuscript the reading that best suited their philosophy. Furthermore, whereas the Rheims-Douay Bible was not radically different from the King James Version, they could now produce a Greek New Testament as an "authoritative" basis for a "revised" Bible that would bring forth a totally new translation, which would not only please Rome, but would also appeal to the ritual-loving modernistic apostates of Protestantism.¹³ The finished Bible would be further from the Received Text than the Rheims-Douay Bible.

Again, by using the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, they could claim that because these manuscripts date back to around 331 AD, the revision would be given credibility by virtue of the supposition that the older the manuscript, the more likely it would follow the autographs.

But, as we have seen, this theory is a fallacy on two counts. Firstly, older is no necessarily purer; and secondly, the Waldensian Bibles were of the Antiochan-Itala family, the original of which is reliably dated by the historian Allox and by Scrivener, one of the foremost English critics, at 157 AD.

While Westcott and Hort were busy with their new Greek Testament, agitation for the Revision was increasing. Most of this agitation emanated from the Oxford Movement which, as we have seen, was the brain-child of Dr Newman.

The Church of England at this time, consisted of two Convocations - North and South. Neither showed any interest in the proposed revision. A trio of bishops, led by an eminent Revisionist, Bishop Ellicott, sought to overcome this problem by persuading Queen Victoria to appoint a Royal Commission

¹² Hoskier cited in "Which Bible" p 136.

¹³ To this day, we see well meaning Protestants appealing to this corrupt text of Westcott and Hort as though it were a faithful translation of the original Greek!

for Revision, but they were flatly refused.

In the Southern Convocation was a very influential bishop of Oxford named Samuel Wilberforce. Ellicott was able to persuade him that a revision of passages where there were plain errors and obsolete words was desirable. Accordingly, in 1870 the Southern Convocation passed a resolution expressing the extent to which they would allow revision, and an amendment was added to included the Old Testament. It read:

"Whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in translation made from the same, shall on due investigation, be found to exist" (W.F. Moulton, **"The English Bible"**, p 215).

A committee of sixteen then sought the support of the Northern Convocation. But this Convocation was obviously awake to the true motives of the revisionists, so they declined saying.

"The time was not favourable for revision, and that the risk was greater than the probably gain" (ibid p 216).

So, the Southern Convocation decided to proceed alone, but with certain precautionary rules and provisos:

"That Revision should touch the Greek text only where found necessary; should alter the language only where, in the judgment of most competent scholars, such change was necessary; and in such necessary changes, the style of the King James should be followed" (Wilkinson, **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 164).

Here is indisputable evidence that the Received Text, which included the Greek text of Erasmus, had the complete confidence of the Church of England. One has only to read the preface to the King James Bible to realise that this text was regarded as truly reflecting the original (or apostolic tongues).

Accordingly, in 1870 a Revision Body consisting of eighteen members was formed, seven of whom were to take care of the New Testament; the remainder, the Old Testament. Prominent among the New Testament Seven was Dr Moulton who had been a leading advocate of revision and was an open admirer of the Jesuit-Rheims New Testament. He revealed his critical bent when he claimed:

"The Rheimish Testament agrees with the best critical editions of the present day" (Moulton, **"The English Bible"**, p 185).

The Seven then sent out invitations which were accepted by eighteen others, thus bringing the New Testament Revision Committee to twenty-five. Not surprisingly, Dr Newman and his successor in the Oxford Movement, Dr Pusey, were among the invitees. Surprisingly, at first sight, they both declined, but in hindsight, it proved to be a very wise decision, for these men had openly declared their apostate positions and, being very sagacious, they were not about to cause unnecessary alarm. They knew that the Anglican clerics, Drs Westcott and Hort, now had an opportunity to inject their Romanised Greek New Testament into the "Revised" Bible and it was vital that they be elected. Furthermore, it would be preferable to have the "Protestants" do the job themselves. In the end, both were elected, along with Moulton's colleagues, Drs Lightfoot and Ellicott - all committed ritualists and critical revisers.

One fly in the ointment was Bishop Wilberforce who, as we have seen, had been persuaded to support revision on the understanding that as little alteration as possible be made to the Authorised Bible. It was his assent that had led to the consent of the Southern Convocation, so it was virtually mandatory that he be elected as Chairman.

The Old Testament Committee, which also elected others, built up their numbers to twenty-seven. But, for the purpose of this book, our attention will settle on the affairs of the New Testament revisers and the politics employed by Westcott and Hort to ensure the success of their scheme to destroy the

Protestant Bible.

Prior to getting down to business, Westcott indicated his traitorous intentions to disregard the Terms of Reference as laid down by the Convocation. He wrote:

"The rules though liberal are vague, and the interpretation of them will depend upon decided action at first" (Hemphill, **"History of the Revised Version"**, p 44).

Westcott would have no doubt about Hort's willingness to participate in such dishonest conniving. As far back as 1851, even before they had commenced their Greek New Testament, Hort had expressed his hatred of the Received Text:

"Think of that vile Textus Receptus" (**"Life of Hort"**, Vol. I p 211).

It is quite evident that Ellicott, the Bishop of Gloucester, was a kindred character, for Westcott was able to reassure Hort:

"The Bishop of Gloucester seems to be quite capable of accepting heartily, and adopting personally a thorough scheme" (**"Life of Westcott"**, Vol. I p 393).

And, as to the purpose of the "scheme", Westcott had left no doubt, when he wrote to his friend, Benson, on November 7, 1870:

"In a few minutes, I go with Lightfoot to Westminster. More will come of these meetings, I think, than simply a Revised Version" (ibid p 367).¹⁴

It did not take long for the conspirators to put their "scheme" into action. At the very first meeting, Chairman Wilberforce was made to see just what the majority of committee members

¹⁴ Let this miserable confession be noted by those who persist in claiming that the Revised Version is a genuine revision of the King James Bible. The very name of this version is as dishonest as the schemers themselves.

were about. He gave vent to his despair in a letter to a colleague:

"What can be done in this miserable business?"
(Hemphill, "History", p 36).

No wonder! There on the revision team was a non-Christian, the well known Unitarian, Dr G. Vance Smith. Westcott had recently enraged English Christians by encouraging this unbeliever in the divinity of Christ to participate in a communion service at Westminster Abbey!

Wilberforce found the situation so upsetting that he effectively resigned by refraining from attending any future meetings. (He died a very disillusioned man some three years later). The schemers were delighted. They promptly installed Ellicott as Chairman.¹⁵ The "scheme" was now assured of success!

A relatively small minority, represented principally by Dr Scrivener, were now left to uphold the integrity of the Revision. Scrivener, one of the foremost Greek New Testament scholars, in the mould of another of his contemporaries, Dean Burgon, inevitable clashed with Dr Hort. Relentlessly, Westcott and Hort substituted their Greek text for the Received Text. Ellicott later referred to Scrivener's objections as *"A kind of critical duel between Dr Hort and Dr Scrivener"* ("Ellicott Addresses", p 61).

Needless to say, Scrivener and his minority supporters were systematically and consistently out-voted. The learned Bishop Gore is adamant that the Greek text used by the revisers followed the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Manuscripts ("New Commentary", Part III p 721).

Therefore it was inevitable that, far from *"A few necessary changes in the interests of clarity"*, the Revised New Testament was altered in thousands of places - 5,337 of these related to the Greek Text. (Dr Everts, "The Westcott and Hort Text

¹⁵ The practice of resigning as a form of objection is fatally flawed.

All too often error has been allowed to prosper simply because good men vacate the floor to make way for the bad.

Under Fire", Bibliotheca Sacra, January 1921).

Perhaps no stronger evidence of the fact that the so-called revision was a Roman-inspired plot to replace the Protestant Bible with a Catholic one, comes from the traitorous Cardinal Wiseman, who, along with Newman, devised the whole dastardly scheme. When it became evident that the "Revision" was about to become an accomplished fact he could no longer contain his exuberance, saying,

"When we consider the scorn cast by the Reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, [Vaticanus and Sinaiticus] as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the Vulgate, and obtained for it its critical pre-eminence are Protestants" (Wiseman, "Essays", Vol. I p 104).

Although the revisers worked in great secrecy, it is obvious from the above quote that Wiseman was in close touch with his Protestant dupes. He and Newman were now about to see the successful conclusion of the commission given them some thirty-three years earlier by Father Benigno - the Superior of the Franciscans.

Chapter Nineteen

The Fraud Exposed

As the day for publication of the Revised Version approached, there was great expectation in the English-speaking world. Although the revisers had remained secretive and had consistently refused to release details of their work, yet those responsible for its marketing had been very active. In Britain and America, Christians were anticipating an improved version of their beloved King James Bible.

Drs Westcott and Hort had preserved similar secrecy with their Greek New Testament and only allowed it to be released by the publisher a few days prior to the publication of the New Testament portion of the Revised Version, which materialised on May 17, 1881. The Old Testament did not appear until a little later. The reason for such secrecy soon became apparent. Scholars soon came to realise that the "Revision" was a misnomer and that Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament was a resurrected Eusebius text.

One of the first and outstanding objections to this blatant betrayal of the commission given by the Southern Convocation, came from one of the Church of England's ablest Greek scholars, Dr John W Burgon.

Although a clergyman of the High Church, he was against Ritualism and Higher Criticism. Educated at Oxford, he was one of the few whose belief in Christ's dictum that "*My words shall not pass away*" (Matthew 24:35), enabled him to remain unscathed by the raging controversies brought on by the Oxford Movement and Tractarianism. His Brilliant scholastic ability was rewarded with a Fellowship of Oriel College and later, as

Vicar of the University Church of St Marys. After becoming Gresham Professor of Divinity, he spent his remaining twelve years as Dean of Chichester.

His conviction of the inerrancy of Scripture and his outstanding knowledge of New Testament Greek, gave him great confidence in the traditional New Testament Text which he believed to have been handed down from apostolic times. Predicably, he did not find himself on the revision team.

It is easy to imagine the interest with which he awaited the Revised Version's release, for he would be aware of the great danger to which the revision had been exposed when placed in the hands of so many ritualistic Higher Critics. What he eventually found galvanised him to prompt action. He wrote three articles for the "Quarterly Review".

In the first article, "The New Greek Text" he claimed that:

"The very citadel of revealed truth [was] undergoing systematic assault and battery, [and that the revision was] founded on an entirely new revision of the Greek Text" ("Article, 1 pp 1, 2).

In other words, far from being a revision, it was a new translation!

Article II dealt with "The New English Version" [of the New Testament]. Referring to the reckless way in which the revisers had deliberately disregarded the Convocation's instructions to make as few alterations as necessary to remove "*plain and clear errors*", Burgon lamented the fact that it had not been foreseen that:

"The Revisionists, [besides systematically removing out of sight so many genuine utterances of the Spirit] would themselves introduce a countless number of blemishes, unknown to it before"¹⁶

¹⁶ Burgon makes a point in connection with the appearance of modern versions. Generally speaking, the "blemishes" have increased in number, until today, the so-called Protestant Bibles and recent Catholic Bibles have moved much further from the Received text than the Catholic Douay Version.

Article III, "**Westcott and Hort's New Textual Theory**" was quite a lengthy tome, showing that their theory was based on a false presumption that the older the manuscripts, the purer they must be.

It should not be thought by the reader that Dr Burgon was alone in his objection to the "fraud of revision". Indeed, we have noted the continual battle which the heroic Dr Scrivener waged for ten years during the period of revision. When Burgon later had his three "**Quarterly Review**" articles republished under the title: "**The Revision Revised**", there also appeared a scholarly work: "**Introduction to the New Testament**" by Dr Scrivener, debunking Westcott and Hort's textual criticism. Concerning the system devised by Westcott and Hort which was used as the basis for the Revision, he said:

"There is little hope for the stability of their imposing structure if its foundations have been laid on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture Dr Hort's system [therefore], is entirely destitute of historical foundation" ("**Scrivener's Introduction**", 1883 pp 531, 537).

One would suppose that had the Revisers carried out their instructions to make a good Bible better, it would have become immensely popular, and superseded the King James Version. But under the circumstances this was not the case. Although, initially sales were very good, this was entirely due to the curiosity and expectations aroused in people's minds by the terrific barrage of advertising propaganda. No doubt Bishop Wordsworth summed up the general feeling when he compared the Revised Version with the King James Bible while addressing the Lincoln Diocesan Conference:

"To pass from one to the other, is as it were, to alight from a well built and well hung carriage which glides easily over a macadamised road, and to get into one which has bad springs or none at all, and in which you are jolted in ruts with aching bones over the stones of a newly mended and rarely traversed road, like some of the roads in our North Lincolnshire villages" (Cited in

"Revision Revised", p 112).

Although the Revised Version did not succeed in replacing the King James Version, it set in motion a series of so-called revisions, translations and paraphrases which has resulted in a plethora of Bibles, each one claiming to address the inadequacy of its predecessors. Almost invariably, these modern translations have relied on the New Testament of Westcott and Hort, or Greek New Testaments based on those few minority manuscripts used by them - in particular the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus. As an example we could cite the Greek New Testament of Nestle.

In order to verify the truth of this assertion it is only necessary to note some changes from the King James Version appearing in the Revised Version and see how many of these are repeated in other versions. One quick check can be made by comparing 2 Peter 2:9. Notice how most of the modern versions follow the Revised Version in placing punishment prior to the judgment. If this were the case, there is no purpose in having a judgment. Furthermore, this text can be used to uphold the dogma of purgatory!

Or, compare Mark 15:28 where we are reminded that Christ had fulfilled the Messianic prophecy by being: *"numbered with the transgressors"*. In all versions following Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, the whole verse is missing.

In the same vein, Acts 8:37 is missing. This is where the eunuch made his confession: *"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"*. And, we could go on.

Jasper James Ray, in his book **"God Wrote Only One Bible"**, tests forty-four Bible versions with 162 selected Scriptural departures from the King James New Testament and the Textus Receptus. Only two New Testament translations pass the test - Martin Luther's and Erasmus's! (He does not list Tyndale's NT, probably because of its close affinity with the KJV). Westcott and Hort's New Testament fails 151 times, The New International Version heads the list of failures 160 times, the Revised Standard Version 158 times, while Nestle's Greek

Text is listed 155 times! These 162 citations are only some of the hundreds of departures from the Received Text.

Meanwhile, in America, initial sales of the Revised Version were tremendous. But, once again, the Revised Version failed to gain popularity. It was thought by some that an Americanised edition of the Revised Version would overcome many of the perceived problems. There was no lack of enthusiasm for an American Version among the growing throng of Bible merchants who were anxious to hear once more the sweet tinkle of their cash registers.

In the following chapter we shall see how the Romanisers of German Protestantism were only too willing to jump on the American bandwagon as had been done in England, through the Oxford Movement.

Chapter Twenty

The Mercersburg Movement (And Its Influence On American Revision)

The contagion of the Oxford Movement soon found victims in North America. Its contaminating theories found ready acceptance among German "Reformationists" in Pennsylvania who were responsible for what came to be known as Mercersburg Theology. What Newman and the Oxford Movement were to Britain, so Dr Philip Schaff and the Mercersburg Movement came to be in America.

Like Newman, Schaff was really an ardent Romanist. Both were traitors to Protestantism. In 1844 Dr Schaff arrived in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, from the University of Berlin, where as a professing Protestant he had shown remarkable aptitude in accepting the Mystical Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Dr Appel described him as

"A gift from the fatherland to the daughter Church on this side of the ocean [America]" (Appel, "Life of John W Nevin", pp 200, 201).

In describing Schaff's penchant for Romanising, one Protestant Reviewer wrote:

"Through the misty drapery of Dr Schaff's philosophy, every essential feature of the papal system stands forth with a prominence so sharply defined, as to leave doubt impossible, and charity in despair" ("New Brunswick Review", p 23).

The same magazine expressed the anxious concern that

Protestantism in America was experiencing a repeat of what happened in England:

"It is quite time that the churches of our country should awake to the extent and tendencies of this movement in the midst of American Protestantism. After a series of advances and retractions, strongly resembling the tactics of the Tractarian party in England, we have at length a bold avowal of the 'primacy of Peter' the fundamental and test doctrine of the Papacy, followed by a concession of every vital point of Christianity - Church, Ministry, Worship, Sacraments, and the right of Private Judgment - to Romanism, and that too, while the name and the forms of Protestantism are (as far as possible) studiously retained" (ibid p 62).

From the foregoing brief glimpse of Dr Schaff's philosophy, it is not hard to believe that, had his conscience been guided by the Christian ethic of honesty, he would have renounced all pretence of being a Protestant. On the contrary, he was seen by the enemies of Bible-believing Protestants as the ideal counterpart of such people as Westcott, Hort and Ellicott who had foisted the fraud of Revision on the English-speaking world.

Bishop Ellicott revealed the English involvement in the American Revision by requesting Dr Schaff to take the initiative in leading out in the formation of the American Revision Committee and then its work. This he was quite happy to do. His predilection for a version that would please Roman Catholics is illustrated in his "Church History" where he translated Matthew 16:18 in a way which would favour the apostle Peter as being the first pope. The New Brunswick Review commented on his audacity in this way:

"Dr Schaff has laid his hand on the text itself. With unparalleled audacity he has translated Matthew 16:18, 'thou art a rock,' and 'on this rock,' etc., as if 'Peter' and the 'rock' were expressed in the original by the same word. Bellarmine has not ventured to do this nor

any other Romanist within our knowledge" (ibid May 1854 p 57).¹⁷

An example of Schaff's domineering efforts to reflect Romanism in the text of the American Revision is seen in his insistence that the Committee alter the rendering of Acts 20:28 to read "bishops" instead of "overseers".

As with the English revisers, there was a Unitarian on the American Committee. His name was Dr Ezra Abbott. Hence it was not unexpected that he should argue strongly to portray Romans 5:9 as a doxology to God, rather than to Christ. He succeeded in expressing his view in the margin (See Riddle, **"Story of the American Revised Version"**, p 32).

Briefly, we have seen how the pagan and papal leprosy of Origen and Jerome seeped into England and America through the Higher Critical theology of Germany via two traitors to Protestantism, Newman and Schaff. Thus Rome had sought to stem the tide of Protestantism's Reform which was flowing

¹⁷ Dr Schaff's attitude to matthew 16:18 is still alive and well among so-called Protestants. A senior theology lecturer at Avondale College writes for the Seventh-day Adventist out-reach journal in Australasia, *"Signs of the Times"*.

"The name Peter, in both Aramaic and Greek means 'rock' Jesus wisely declared that he would establish His community on a firm foundation. 'You are Peter and on this rock I will build my church' (Matthew 16:18). ...

"Jesus however, didn't intend to build his community on Peter as such - but on Peter as the first of those who would recognise Him as Messiah.

"It was Peter's confession, 'you are the Christ, the Son of the living God' (Matthew 16:16), that made him the suitable person from which to begin to build the Messianic community" (*"Signs"*, Vol 107, No 8, 1992).

Such statements clash with true Protestantism as expressed in the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: "The name peter is derived from the Greek petros, a stone, generally from a small slab of stone. The word 'rock' is the Greek petra, the large mass of rock itself

"It [Peter's affirmation] is incidental, not fundamental, that Peter was the first to recognise and declare his faith But Jesus is ever and only the 'Rock' on which the entire [Church] structure rests" (*"SDA Bible Commentary"*, Vol 5, pp 430, 431).

from the English-speaking world like a veritable flood of life-giving truth.

At the forefront of the tremendous efforts exerted by English-speaking Protestants in disseminating the King James Bible and translations into foreign languages was the British and Foreign Bible Society. Formed in 1804 by Protestants for the spread of Bibles based only on the Received Text, it was shortly to be followed by other Bible Societies such as The New York Bible Society in 1809 (Now New York Bible Society, International), and the American Bible Society founded in 1816.

When the Revised Version of 1881 came out in England, the Society immediately recognised it for what it was - a Roman inspired Bible and refused to distribute it. It was only logical then, that the Protestant Bible Societies should receive the attention of Rome, for only a devitalised society could be expected to distribute a devitalised Bible.

In the following chapters we shall briefly trace the history of the Bible Societies and document their relationship to the Received Text.

Chapter Twenty-One

The Bible Societies

On March 7, 1804 thirty-six Protestants assembled in London and formed the British and Foreign Bible Society. Fifteen of its members were Anglicans, fifteen were of other Christian communions and six were Christian foreigners who were resident close to London.

At the first annual meeting it was realised that an amendment to Article one of their constitution was necessary. This was because the founding members had taken it for granted that there was only one genuine English-language Bible. The amendment now removed any doubt about the founders' intention for the Society by adding:

"The only copies in the language of the United Kingdom to be circulated by the Society shall be the Authorised Version [King James Bible] without note or comment" (Canton, *"The History of the British and Foreign Bible Society"*, 1904, Vol. I p 17).

Canton comments on Protestant philosophy behind this amendment:

"It echoed the cry of the martyr-Church of the Waldenses, 'The Bible whole and alone'" (ibid).

As the Society's work moved into Europe, especially into countries where the Reformation had been subverted by Romanising "Protestants", there was considerable agitation to have the Society bring out Bibles which contained extra-canonical material such as the Apocrypha.

Accordingly, the British and Foreign Bible Society allowed its foreign societies discriminatory powers, providing no notes or comments were used (*ibid* p 335).

It seems that such permission to print the Apocrypha was aimed at keeping European patronage, but the change was brought about without the knowledge of other British supporters. When it was discovered that their money was being used to further the Roman cause there was trouble.

On December 20, 1824 the Society's Committee sought to clarify the situation by refusing any funding of spurious Scriptures. A resolution was passed which stated:

"That no pecuniary grant be made by the Committee of this Society for the purpose of aiding the printing or publishing any edition of the Bible, in which the Apocrypha shall be mixed and interspersed with Canonical Books of Holy Scriptures" (*ibid* p 337).

Much controversy and dissatisfaction arose among some of the European Societies, but the parent Society made a fresh resolve to keep its hands clean of Roman contamination and in 1826 the resolution became law (*ibid*). Again in 1839 the Society found it necessary to pass a resolution, this time refusing to recognise Bibles derived from the Roman Vulgate as the Word of God. But those who favoured Roman Bibles were persistent and again in 1856 and 1857 the Society emphatically refused the distribution of Bibles based on the Vulgate, saying that they were in the business of promoting the King James Version (*ibid* p 63).

Another controversy had also arisen quite early in the Society's history and this dealt with Unitarianism. Problems had arisen over the apparent reluctance of some to open the Society's meetings with prayer, the reason being, that if prayer to God was offered in the name of Jesus Christ, the few Unitarians belonging to the Society would take offence. After much discussion in which it was unsuccessfully urged that the Society and all its members subscribe to the doctrine of the Trinity, a break away Society was formed, known as the

Trinitarian Bible Society. The year was 1831 and the Society is active to this day, remaining firm in its resolve.

With the advent of the Revised Version in 1881, the British and Foreign Bible Society Committee's report for that year records its attitude to the New Testament Revision. Because of the First Amendment restricting distribution in the English language to the King James Version, much difficulty ensued. Obviously, some on the Committee had been fooled into believing that England had been given a genuine Revision, while others, like Burgon and Scrivener, had seen through the Romish plot to give England a Catholic Bible.

By the year 1901, the Society caved in to mounting pressure and by a majority vote it was agreed to include the Revised Version in its own published editions (Roe, "A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society", Introduction).

But the Trinitarian Bible Society would have nothing to do with the Revised Version. Its members had noted that Unitarians had been on the Committee of Revisers and consequently concluded that the Revised Version must be tainted. Some members of the British and Foreign Bible Society were already transferring their support to the Trinitarian Bible Society. In July 1902 the Trinitarian Bible Society officially rejected the Revised Version (Brown, "The Word of God Among All Nations", p 84).

In spite of the acceptance of the Revised Version by the British and Foreign Bible Society, it failed to replace the Authorised Version which Protestants had grown to love and revere, which just illustrates how pressures for change towards apostasy usually come from the top.

Meanwhile, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Societies had been formed in America. In 1817 the British and Foreign Bible Society entered Australia by forming an Auxiliary in Sydney, which soon became known as the British and Foreign Bible Society (in Australia).

The British and Foreign Bible Society quickly showed that it was living up to its name by disseminating Bibles on a global scale. As the Scriptures were brought within easy reach of the

literate, so the economics of large production made them easily affordable by the masses.

In many places around the world, people were seriously studying the Bible but unlike the Roman Catholic Bibles, there were no explanatory notes, and people were the more likely to interpret Scripture as the Holy Spirit directed them. This had always been Rome's great fear and the very reason why she had bitterly opposed the free use of Scripture among her laity.

Hence there arose a great number of non-conformist sects, many of which were to blossom into well-known and highly respected Protestant denominations. Especially was this so in North America where the American Bible Society flourished as a Protestant institution.

As to the apostolic pedigree of the Authorised King James Bible, we can be certain that the American Bible Society had no doubts. As recently as 1939 their periodic publication, **"The Book of a Thousand Tongues"**, made this highly significant statement:

"Our Gospels also existed separately in Syriac dress. They were termed the Gospel of the Separated, to distinguish them from Tatian's work [Alexandrian Text] It passed from East to West. It took a Latin form, as Dr Wace has shown in the sixth century, and then in the ninth century was turned into old Saxon In this form, says Dr Wace, the Gospel lived in the heart of the German people, and in due time produced Luther and the German Bible, thus binding together the second century and the sixteenth, the East and the West" (p 902).

Can an honest reader doubt that the American Bible Society is here referring to the King James Bible? "Our Gospels" positively identified their Bible as the only Bible that had been translated into anything like a "Thousand Tongues". Their tracing of the lineage of their New Testament from the Syriac (Antioch/Peshitta) Bible and the "Latin form" (Itala), through to the Bible of Luther, can only apply to the Received Text used

by Luther and Tyndale, enabling the King James translators to produce the Authorised Bible.

The American Bible Society made doubly sure that "Our Gospels" could not be confused with the Roman Vulgate, by identifying the King James Version as the progeny of the "Bible of the Separated" - not the Alexandrian, not the American Revised Version, not any of the plethora of modern versions that were pouring off the revisionists' presses. No! It was the Bible of King James to which they referred!

Neither was the American Bible Society alone in placing its trust and confidence in the King James Version as the true Word of God. In 1924, the Presbyterian Church paper, "**The Herald and Presbyter Times**", had issued this very discerning and timely insight into the confusion arising among Protestants:

"There is an idea in the minds of some people that scholarship demands the laying aside of the Authorised [King James] Bible, and taking up the latest Revised Version. This is an idea, however, without proper foundation. This Revised Version is in large part in line with what is known as Modernism, and is peculiarly acceptable to those who think that any change, anywhere and in anything, is progress. Those who have already investigated the matter, and are in sympathy with what is Evangelical, realise that the Revised Version is part of the movement to "Modernise" Christian thought and faith, and do away with established truth" (July 16, 1924).

How much more pertinent would such comment be to the situation today! It is precisely because the Revised Version and its imitators were rejected by discerning Christians that Protestants grew up using a standard Bible and thus were able to memorise and uniformly repeat the jewels contained therein.

But things were to change and, strange to say, pressure to change was to come from Protestant churches and institutions. It came slowly at first, almost imperceptibly, as the colleges of the Protestants increasingly introduced modern versions to their

theological students. This should not be the least surprising as we have already seen how the Jesuits quickly put into practice the plan formulated at the Council of Trent to infiltrate Protestant colleges and institutions.

As Protestant graduates went out to occupy the pulpits, their use of the new versions began to give credence to the thought expressed in the "**Herald and Presbyter Times**" that those with "educated" discernment had discovered Bibles which they thought were more reliable than the King James Version.

Strangely, the exposure of the fraud of the "Revision" by Scrivener and especially Dean Burgon, was little headed, if not ignored. In North America it is doubtful whether the warnings from England had been given any significant exposure. But, in every age, God has His messengers who give warnings and reproof commensurate with the need of the times. One such man was Dr Benjamin G. Wilkinson of the USA.

It will be profitable to divert our attention from the Bible Societies in order to devote a chapter to this modern-day Burgon.

Chapter Twenty-Two

A Twentieth-Century Burgon

Benjamin G. Wilkinson Phd, Dean of Theology at Washington Missionary College, Washington D.C., was a man with a very inquiring mind. Brought up in the best Protestant tradition of the "Bible and the Bible only", he was concerned that the Bible on which his faith had been founded was increasingly being neglected. In fact, in the academic world in which he moved, the idea was gaining ground that those who persisted with the King James Authorised Version were merely evincing inferior judgment and poor scholarship.

Wilkinson had devoted considerable study to the history of Christianity and the preservation of apostolic truth throughout the Dark Ages, also the hazardous struggles of those who launched and consolidated the Protestant Reformation. He was later to record his research in his classic work, **"Truth Triumphant"**, which was published in 1944 by Pacific Press Publishing Association, and ran into several reprints. During his research, he found that the history of the New Testament Text was inextricably entwined with the struggle to maintain apostolic Christianity against paganism and, later, factional Christianity. It became clear that it was the church which was "driven into the wilderness" that had maintained apostolic truth because it had also been the guardian of God's Holy Word. This line of Scripture is what was known as the Traditional or Byzantine Text, which was later incorporated into the Greek New Testament by Erasmus and then used by Luther, Tyndale and the King James translators. It is now commonly known as the Received Text.

Wilkinson realised that he had sufficient material to bring out a book on this subject alone, so in 1930 he published his findings under the title, **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**. Apparently he had difficulty in finding a publisher for his book, an indication perhaps of a growing preference for modern versions, for he had to act as his own publisher. Hence, the book's comparatively restricted circulation during his lifetime.

Wilkinson's book indicates that he was in possession of Dean Burgon's **"Revision Revised"** and that he was in complete agreement with Burgon's contention that the very title **"Revised Version"** is a misnomer and a fraud. But Wilkinson went much further. He dealt with his subject in its historical settings and demonstrated how the diversions from the Received Text affect basic Christian doctrine; eg. the divinity of Christ, the Trinity, and the way in which they are biased toward Roman Catholic theology and against fundamental Protestantism.

But further, he demonstrated the highly damaging effect on the beliefs of the church which employed him as an ordained minister - namely the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Incredibly, although his book enjoyed wide acceptance among his ministerial colleagues, it was rejected outright by a "Committee of Review" set up in 1930 by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists with headquarters in Washington D.C.

The term "incredibly" is used deliberately, for this denomination was one which arose in America around the mid-nineteenth century as a direct result of the prevalent interest in the study of the Bible and its prophecies. Many students of prophecy in various Protestant denominations in both Old and New Worlds were convinced by the signs given in Matthew 24 and other parts of the Bible, that Christ's promised return was close at hand. Among such people were members of the Methodist and Baptist Churches who decided that they should lay aside all preconceived beliefs and creeds and turn prayerfully to a thorough study of the Bible and the Bible only.

Naturally, the Bible which they studied was the Protestant King James Version. Having determined to follow only those

things revealed in God's Word and to let the Bible be its own interpreter, they soon found themselves in a dilemma. For one thing, they found that the *"law of the LORD is perfect"* (Psalm 19:7), and that Christ has said that he had not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it and that it would remain as long as heaven and earth should last (Matthew 5:17, 18). Why had they then, along with other Christian churches, ignored one of God's Commandments - the fourth - by keeping holy the first day of the week instead of the seventh? (Exodus 20:8-12). Why had Jesus closed His Revelation to John with the words:

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they might have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city?" (Revelation 22:14).

As these inquiring people continued in prayer and study, they were greatly impressed by the message of the three angels found in **Revelation 14:6-11**, followed by verse twelve which says:

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus".

In the first angel's message (Verses six and seven), they came to see that at the time of the end *"the everlasting gospel"* was to include a call to prepare the world for Christ's imminent second advent and its attendant judgment. This was to be accomplished by emphasising the importance of returning to the true way of worshipping the Creator by keeping holy the day on which God rested from His creative work - the seventh day of the fourth Commandment.

In keeping with their earlier resolve to follow the Bible only, they decided to keep holy the Biblical day of rest (Saturday) and eventually, in the year 1860 the name Seventh-day Adventist was formally adopted, the name being expressive of their beliefs. How then, some seventy years later, could the leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church reject the work of B. G. Wilkinson, one of their own educationalists who upheld the purity of the very Bible from which SDA pioneers had

discerned their beliefs? In fact, his church had already smeared the integrity of the King James Version, at least within its own theological curricula.

In 1926, the SDA's Berrien Springs College Press published a booklet, **"Doctrines for use in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges"**, in which it claimed the American Revised Version to be *"more accurate, more scholarly, more valuable"* than the Authorised Bible (p 59).

The author has had the opportunity of examining the SDA General Conference's review of Wilkinson's book. He has to agree with Wilkinson that it is more of an attack than a review, for his unnamed reviewers entirely ignored the historical aspect which involved the papal led intrigue, conceived at the Council of Trent, to replace the Protestant Bible with Rome's counterfeit, the 1881 Revised Version.

So patently devoid of common logic and scholarship is this so-called "Review", that the main reason for rejecting Wilkinson's book is adequately summed up by the fear expressed therein by the reviewers themselves:

"We would become the laughing stock of the reverent Christian scholarship of the world" ("Committees Review", Section I p 39).

So, the leaders of the SDA Church that had proudly proclaimed themselves as *"The people of the Bible"*, succumbed to the pressure of their peers in a system of Protestantism that scarcely regarded them as anything more than leaders of a cult! What a contrast to the unwavering resolve of the brave army of martyrs in the mould of Tyndale and others who sacrificed their lives in order that the world might be given the very Bible which had been responsible for bringing Protestantism in general, and Adventism in particular into existence!

Apparently Wilkinson's book had stirred up a hornets's nest. Within a year the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists decided to cool the debate by issuing a directive saying *"That the controversy over the use of versions should be avoided"*. Then they threw a sop to both sides by stating that

"the 1611 King James Version and the 1901 American Revised Version shall serve us without discrimination". Their chief motivation for concern was made known when they appealed for unity by *"Leaving all free to use the version of their choice"* (see **"Problems in Translation"**, pp 74, 75, a General Conference Publication, authors undeclared).

In consideration of the fact that we have seen that the King James Version is a Protestant Bible (Received Text), while the Revised Version and the American Revised Version contain Roman Vulgate implants, and that they disagree with the KJV in numerous places in matters of importance (see Chapter Twenty-Seven), we can only conclude that at least some Seventh-day Adventist leaders have absolutely no idea as to which book is God's Word! Hence, seeing their beliefs are claimed to be Biblically-based, they have a problem of gargantuan proportions. They should expect massive doctrinal confusion to follow!

For instance, having noticed the importance which the pioneers of the SDA Church attached to the judgment-hour message of the first angel of Revelation chapter fourteen, we can only wonder why today they should be interested in warning people of a judgment that, in the Revised Version, American Revised Version and New International Version, is placed after a period of punishment! How nicely such a rendition fits with papal dogma of purgatory! (2 Peter 2:9, RSV etc). On the other hand, the King James Version portrays the judgment correctly as a means of determining who are to be punished and who are not.

If both versions of the text are equally inspired, we have to ask the question, "Inspired by whom?" Surely we are not expected to believe that our God is a God of confusion! If so, we would have to reject 1 Corinthians 14:33: *"For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints"* (KJV).

Fortunately, for Seventh-day Adventism, the laity took absolutely no notice of the General Conference's dualism. As with Protestant churches generally, the King James Bible

continued to reign supreme in their homes, their churches and to a large extent, in their primary and high schools. Their young people grew up like other Protestants, learning to give an answer for their faith by memorising and repeating Bible texts in uniformity.

Chapter Twenty-Three

The Romanising of the Bible Societies

In spite of an increasing stream of new versions, the Protestant nature of the Bible Societies in the English-speaking world dominated well into the second half of the twentieth century. A case in point is the history of the British and Foreign Bible Society in New South Wales, Australia. In a graph analysing types of Bibles sales from the year 1961 to 1989 (supplied by the New South Wales Bible Society to the author in May 1992), we find that in the years 1961 and 1962 one hundred percent of sales were King James Versions. In 1963, a small percentage of Revised Standard Versions were sold and by 1966 we find that sales of the RSV had outstripped sales of the KJV.

In 1970, the New English Bible showed up as a small percentage of sales and remained that way until it vanished from the graph in 1977. In 1972 the Living Bible made its appearance and in 1977 there commenced the reign of the Good News Bible. The New International Version arrived in 1979 and has maintained steady sales of around ten percent of total sales. By 1989, the last year shown on the graph, sales of the KJV represented a mere 5.63 percent of total sales!

Such records reflect the scene in most Bible House showrooms where it has become increasingly obvious that little space is devoted to the display of the King James Bibles. How has this state of affairs come about in such a short period of time?

We have already seen how early in its history, the British and Foreign Bible Society showed a surprising capacity to give into

the demands of its affiliate societies, especially in European countries. We noted how the Trinitarian Bible Society came into being in response to such vacillation and, in spite of the trend to modern versions, it still maintains its resolve to distribute only Bibles based on the Received Text. The obvious inference is that one Society has succumbed to the will of man, while the other has retained its resolve to make known to man, the will of God.

So, to answer our question, we shall now go behind the scenes and look at the out-working of Rome's continuing plan to subvert Protestantism by displacing its Bible with what Rome is pleased to call *"interconfessional Bibles"*. And, as in the past, we shall see how Rome clearly uses professing Protestant organisations and institutions to do her subversive work.

Let us never forget that all of Rome's schemes and efforts are designed with the sole purpose of achieving the goal set at the Council of Trent - to bring about unity on Rome's terms. Remove the basis of Protestantism by destroying confidence and faith in the Bible as God's revelation of His will for man, and then it becomes relatively easy to replace Biblically-based faith with trust in a religious system - a system whose priests then become the sole guardians of the gateway to heaven.

Those who are tempted to think that Rome's ideas on unity allow for compromise on her part will do well to ponder her history and take note of her numerous considered statements. At a Catholic Conference held in Preston on September 10, 1894 Cardinal Vaughan appealed to *"the conscience of our separated brethren"*:

"The Catholic Church cannot accept reunion or communion on the condition of change, or modification, or compromise in her own Divine constitution. The charter of constitution was drawn up by her Divine Founder. It is therefore altogether outside her power to alter it But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit change and modifications in her discipline and legislation which concern time and circumstances" (Quoted by Trinitarian Bible Society,

"Rome and Reunion" Tract No 4 pp 3, 4).

Rome was willing to make such a "change or modification" in her attitude to the availability of Scripture in order to break down Protestant opposition and capture the great Bible Societies. She therefore was willing to demonstrate an important change in attitude by relaxing her restrictions which heretofore has banned the possession of the Scripture by her laity. But at the same time she made sure that the versions approved for their use carried appropriate notes and explanations - all designed to interpret certain readings in line with her doctrines and liturgy.

It was not long before wishful-thinking Protestants saw this change as a healthy Roman move towards accepting Scripture as authority, and they took the bait. In this regard, we could mention the Council of Churches, formally a professedly Protestant group who were largely responsible for forming the "United Bible Societies" (UBS) in 1946. Under the umbrella of this "Bible Society wing" of the World Council of Churches are to be found most of the World's Bible Societies. One notable exception is the Trinitarian Bible Society with headquarters in England.

With some seventy-five Bible Societies thus affiliated, the UBS presented an ideal medium which, if infiltrated by Rome's agents, would allow her great influence, if not virtual control of the vast majority of Bible Societies.

With this objective in mind, the Second Vatican Council, held from 1962 to 1965, recommended that Roman Catholics co-operate with Protestant organisations in the translation and distribution of Scripture. Interestingly, as noted by the graph of sales supplied by the New South Wales Bible Society, a modern version shows up for the first time in 1963 in the form of the Revised Standard Version - right in the middle of Vatican II!

The recommendation was acted upon almost immediately, when in June 1964 the Roman Catholics attended a major conference of Bible Societies in Driebergen. The Trinitarian Bible Society did not attend. (Brown, **"The Word of God**

Among All Nations", p 122). This conference turned out to be a watershed in the UBS policy on Bible distribution.

It was agreed:

"To prepare a 'common text' of the Bible in the original languages, acceptable to all Churches, including Roman Catholics; and to explore the possibility of preparing a 'common translation' in certain languages, which could be used by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike. It was further recommended that the Bible Societies should consider translating and publishing the Apocrypha when Churches specifically requested it" (Brown, **"The Word of God Among All Nations"**, p 122).

In 1966 the British and Foreign Bible Society acted on this recommendation and amended its constitution to allow the Apocrypha to be included in their translation, and the same policy was adopted by the United Bible Society. (Trinitarian Bible Society, **"Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies"**, Article No 72, p 8).

Simultaneously, talks between the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Executive Committee of the United Bible Society got under way. So fruitful were those meetings that it was publicly announced in 1968 that Pope Paul VI had approved a document agreed to by both parties entitled, **"Guiding Principles for Interconfessional Co-operation in Translating the Bible"**.

As the American Bible Society had become associated with the National Council of Churches in 1950 and, like the British and Foreign Bible Society, had become a member of the UBS, Rome now succeeded in co-opting the resources of two of the world's great Bible Societies in producing and or distributing interconfessional Bibles. In plain language, this means Bibles that are doctrinally and liturgically acceptable to both Rome and present-day Protestants would be distributed as a united team effort.

All that was needed now was for Rome to work through various Protestant churches to bring about a spirit of tolerance

and ecumenism, and a preference for the coming avalanche of corrupted versions. With this object in mind, the Vatican formed an organisation known as the: **"World Catholic Federation for Biblical Apostolate"**.

Chapter Twenty-Four

Interconfessional Bibles and Ecumenism

The World Catholic Federation for Biblical Apostolate (WCFBA), is a Roman Catholic organisation formed solely for the purpose of promoting ecumenism through participation in the translation of interconfessional Bibles. But it does seem that the Vatican is quite happy to let so-called Protestant organisations such as the Bible Societies bear the brunt of the cost of production and distribution of these Bibles.

As an example, an examination of the Bible Society's (New South Wales, Australia) report on donations received from denominations during the 1990/1991 financial year is revealing. Of the seventeen contributing denominations listed, by far the strongest supporter was the Anglican Church (\$129,864.00). This probably reflects the continuing ties with the British and Foreign Bible Society, in spite of the relatively recent name change to "The Bible Society in Australia". But the Roman Catholic Church's contribution during that year was a mere \$917.00! This compared unfavourably with one of the smaller Protestant churches - The Seventh-day Adventist Church, which gave \$4,045.00.¹⁸

Although insignificant in monetary terms, the fact that Rome

¹⁸ Evidently the SDA's admiration for the Bible Society's ecumenical role and the type of Bibles being sold, has now increased considerably. A report on page 11 of the SDA's March 13, 1993 issue of "The Record" carries a report containing the gratitude expressed by the NSW Director of the Bible Society in Australia for the SDA's magnificent contribution during the year of 1992 which amounted to \$24,148.00!

contributed anything at all is highly significant, and is indicative of her perception of success in changing the original purpose of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Rome's previous attitude to the Society's Protestant Version of the Bible was revealed by Pope Pius X when in 1911 his prescribed "**Larger Catechism**" stated:

"If a Christian should be offered a Bible by a Protestant, or by some emissary of the Protestants, he ought to reject it with horror, because it is forbidden by the Church; and if he should have accepted it without noticing what it was, he should at once pitch it into the fire, or fetch it to his Pastor" (Cited, "**The Word of God Among All Nations**", p 121).

The reason for such drastic behaviour is explained by Rome while stating her hostility toward the Bible Societies:

"The attitude of the Church toward the Bible Societies is one of unmistakable opposition. Believing herself to be the divinely appointed custodian and interpreter of Holy Writ she cannot, without turning traitor to herself, approve the distribution of Scripture without note or comment" ("**The Catholic Encyclopedia**", Vol. II, p 545).

The obvious implication of such a radical change in attitude is that the Roman Catholic Church no longer regards the Bible Societies as an effective instrument of Protestantism. No doubt it is joyfully aware that, throughout Australia at least, the value of the Protestant King James Versions sold (1990/1991) has shrunk to a paltry 9.9 percent of total sales (Source, "**Bible Society in Australia**", May 27, 1992).

Architects of this successful capture of Bible Societies which come under the umbrella of the United Bible Society, such as Monsignor Alberto Ablondi, must experience smug satisfaction with the results. Back in 1984, while Bishop of Livorno, Italy, he was a member of the General Committee and European Regional Executive Committee of the UBS. Undoubtedly his

influence on the Societies helped to shape their present-day policies. He views the interconfessional translations of the Bible as:

"One of the important advancements of post Vatican II ecumenism - an important step towards unity" [and that they] "will help overcome prejudice in a divided church" ("Word-Event", No 57/1984 p 6), as reported in the Trinitarian Bible Society, ("Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies", Article No 72, p 9).

And, overcome prejudice they did! In that same year: *"Several Bible Societies changed their constitution, allowing them to have members of Christian denominations on their Board" ("1984 Annual Report of United Bible Society", p 5).*

This, of course, is an indirect way of informing the world that Roman Catholics may serve on the Boards of former Protestant Bible Societies. They wasted no time in claiming their advantage.

"Word-Event" No 56/1984 happily confirms that many Roman Catholics, including several Bishops, were now members of National Bible Society Boards and/or regional committees and that Roman Catholics are serving as Bible translators.

We are indebted to the Trinitarian Bible Society for revealing that:

"One of the joint editors of the widely used United Bible Society's Greek New Testament is a Roman Catholic Cardinal, namely, Carlo M. Martini, the Bishop of Milan" ("United Bible Society", Article No 72, p 9).

This information should be of particular interest to those Christians who feel that in the New International Version of the Bible they have discovered God's revelation to man. They should be aware that the New International Version (NIV) has generally followed the United Bible Society's Greek Translation

of the New Testament (Third Edition) which in turn, like Westcott and Hort's New Testament, is largely based on the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts (See Trinitarian Bible Society article No 74, p 16).

Mind you, the translators of the NIV in their Preface, prefer to tell it another way:

"The Greek text used in the work of translation is an eclectic one".

In plain language, this means selecting the text that best suits one's fancy or need. What a convenient device for facilitating a subjective translation!

When such a device is employed in selecting texts from the great variety of Bible versions now available, the mind boggles at the possibility of finding some semblance of Biblical support for practically any doctrine which man is capable of devising! As a case in point, let us briefly consider the **"New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures"**, the Bible of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

According to J. P. Lewis, the unidentified translators used the Westcott and Hort Greek Text:

"But many other sources were utilised" (**"The English Bible from KJV to NIV"**, p 229).

So, like many other translators, they took an eclectic approach in order to support their doctrines. Especially is this so in respect to their Unitarian belief. Hence in Mark 1:1, all reference to Jesus Christ as the *"Son of God"* is deleted:

"[The] beginning of the Good news about Jesus Christ".

So blatant has been this eclectic approach, that this version has been categorised among

"Tendentious translations because it fosters the distinctive views of a particular sect" (*ibid* p 230).

We have seen how Rome has infiltrated the main Bible Societies through its ecumenical approach and relegated the

King James Version to a mere asterisk in their business. But such success would not have been possible had there not been a demand for the modern versions. It is quite obvious that the Protestant churches have co-operated with Rome to replace the very Bible which has been responsible for bringing them into existence, with other Bibles which are approved by Rome. In Section IV to follow, we shall see how one of the formerly most ardent of Protestant denominations has co-operated with Rome in her grand plan to discredit the Protestant Bible and in the process has turned to corrupted versions which are now being used to negate and even remove the very basis of its distinctive beliefs!

Section Four

Chapters Twenty-Five to Twenty-Eight

The Ecumenical Trap

"It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that so many of the Catholic readings in the New Testament, which the Reformation and early post-Reformation times were denounced by Protestants as corruptions of the pure text of God's Word, should now ... be adopted by Revisers of our time-honoured English Bibles" (Edgar, "Bibles of England", pp 347, 348).

Chapter Twenty-Five

Unheeded Warnings

As Protestant publications increasingly contained articles by scholars and ministers who used modern Bible versions for reference and general purposes, so a number of the Evangelical churches began to express concerns.

In the year 1955, The Eye Opener Publishers of Junction City Oregon published a book by J.A. Ray, **"God Wrote Only One Bible"**, which to the author's knowledge continues to be published. This book, which champions the Received Text, contains a valuable table of forty-four Bible Versions which are tested by 162 scriptures selected by Ray for comparative purposes.

Another strong scholarly defence of the Protestant Bible was made by Dr Edward F. Hills in his book, **"The King James Version Defended"**, published in several editions between 1956 and 1984 by The Christian Research Press of Des Moines, Iowa.

Perhaps no other publisher has in recent times, more consistently warned Christians of Scriptural perversions than "Grand Rapids International Publications" of Grand Rapids, Michigan. In 1970 and through into the 'eighties it has published Dr D.O. Fuller's edited books, which include, **"Which Bible?"**, **"True or False"** and **"Counterfeit or Genuine"**.

Very nearly half of Fuller's popular book, **"Which Bible?"** consists of an abridged republication of B. G. Wilkinson's **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"** (1930). This is the book which, we recall, was rejected by the leaders of the Seventh-

day Adventist Church. Because Wilkinson had to publish his book privately, it had received little exposure outside his own denominational fraternity. In fact, it is easy to believe that Seventh-day Adventist authors and publishers went out of their way to nullify Wilkinson's warnings.

We have seen how Wilkinson traced the history of the New Testament text and convincingly proved that the pedigree of the Received Text went right back to the apostolic era. Furthermore, he refuted the idea that the older manuscripts must necessarily be purer by providing documentary evidence that the most serious corruptions of Scripture took place in the second century AD.

Yet, in 1947, the Seventh-day Adventist's own "Review and Herald Publishing Association" published a book which entirely ignored Wilkinson's argument as well as the facts of history. Having acknowledged that the Westcott and Hort text *"Leans towards the Vulgate"* it claimed:

"This in itself is not a blemish, for it is reasonable to believe that Jerome, when he was working out that standard Latin version, had access to older manuscripts than any that were available to the translators of the Authorised Version" (M.E. Olsen, "The Prose of Our King James Version", p 186).

Such a statement would do credit to the most ardent Roman defender of the Vulgate and is supportive of the claim that the Roman Catholic Church has been the guardian of God's Word. It also ignores the fact that the Catholic Latin Version (Vulgate) has always been in conflict with the Waldensian Bibles (Traditional Text) whose pedigree dates back to the apostolic area of the Antioch church. The martyr Reformers would not be impressed!

Here indeed, is an intriguing mystery. Wilkinson's own "received him not". At first they denounced him and finally ignored him. Yet Dr Fuller, in his preamble to the section of his book featuring Wilkinson, was able to say that although Dr Wilkinson is practically unknown to scholars, a careful study of

his book reveals his thorough knowledge of his subject which shows him to be: "*A scholar of the first rank*" ("*Which Bible?*", p 174).¹⁹

In 1930 a General Conference committee, appointed to review Wilkinson's book, delivered a blistering attack on his "*unauthorised*" work. The author fortunately has a copy of Wilkinson's reply in which he methodically proceeds to dismantle the committee's feeble and puerile arguments. Never again did the General Conference risk another thrashing by attempting to gainsay his book - so it was just ignored.

Furthermore, even as Dr Fuller had decided to arrange his book around Wilkinson's masterful defence of the King James Version, the Seventh-day Adventist Church had decided to launch into a career which can be described as, "*Rome's Little Helper*". Far from being content to mal-advise their own church members to "*Use the version of their choice*" ("*Problems in Translation*", 1954, p 75), they now launched a campaign of public education in which they indiscriminately promoted the modern versions.

Throughout their history, Seventh-day Adventists have placed great reliance on the printed word for the spreading of their concept of the gospel - a gospel which they prefer to describe as "*The everlasting gospel*", as found in Revelation 14. It is because they insist on following the Bible as their only guide and rule of faith that their pioneers arrived at some beliefs that are practically, if not totally, unique to Seventh-day Adventism.

In order to spread their beliefs they have built up a sizeable publishing business and a system of door-to-door distribution of books through a large network of supervised colporteurs.

One such project was a profusely-illustrated book published in 1959 by the denominationally owned Review and Herald Publishing Association in Washington D.C., titled, "**Your Bible**

¹⁹ The author has been told that when Wilkinson's work is occasionally mentioned by students in the Seventh-day Adventist Colleges and Seminaries, his efforts are curtly dismissed with the statement that the denomination has long since proven his arguments to be worthless. The facts are quite different!

and You". It has become well known over the intervening years, not only to Seventh-day Adventists, but to scores of thousands who recognised the author, Arthur S. Maxwell, as Uncle Arthur of "Bedtime Story" fame.

"Your Bible and You", as the name implies, sets out to give people confidence in the Bible as the true Word of God, and it then proceeds to present Adventist beliefs from the Bible and the Bible only. Inexplicably, as it must have seemed to those who knew Maxwell, he promoted all versions of the Bible as of equal value. Referring to the multiplicity of versions available to his readers, he said:

"Perhaps you too are wondering whether the book you hold in your hand is really the Bible. You need not worry. No matter what version it may be, it is still the Word of God" (p 43).

Such a sweeping statement is all the more puzzling when it is realised that only a few years earlier (1946), another of the Adventist presses was still reprinting one of Wilkinson's books, **"Truth Triumphant"**. In this classic history of Christianity, Wilkinson showed that the churches which upheld the apostolic faith throughout the Dark Ages had two things in common. They all had the Traditional or Received Text and they all observed the Biblical seventh-day Sabbath. He convincingly demonstrated that historically there were two lines of Bibles, which have persisted down to this day. One was guarded and handed on to Protestants by the churches in the wilderness, and the other of which Rome was the author and custodian.

This historical fact was completely ignored by Maxwell. He briefly traced the origins of the Bible as emanating from the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus which, incredibly, he portrayed as the *"original text"* (p 35). In such a statement we have an example of an "official" trend which is in utter defiance of Adventism's respected author and commentator Ellen G White, who, on behalf of the denomination, specifically denies that Rome has been the custodian of truth:

"The church in the wilderness', and not the proud hierarchy enthroned in the world's great capital, was the true church of Christ, the guardian of the treasures of truth which God had committed to His people to be given to the world" ("Great Controversy", p 64).

Maxwell continued his platitudes:

"You need to entertain no doubt concerning the essential accuracy of the original text" meaning the aforementioned codices (p 35).

In answer to the question, "Which version is best?" Maxwell was able to lump both Roman and Protestant Bibles together, and impute to them equal authority:

"For through this book, in all its multiplicity of versions and translations, God has chosen to speak to human hearts in all the world" (p 44).

While this is true, it is equally true that in many modern versions Satan also has spoken. Mixing a little deadly error with truth makes a dangerous potion. Maxwell then proceeded to present the messages of Seventh-day Adventism by selectively quoting from the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version. Admittedly, he did give precedence to the KJV by identifying the RSV each time he quoted from it. This man, whom we have every reason to believe was sincere, probably unwittingly demonstrated his confidence in the primacy of the KJV.

But did he realise that he was helping his church in what now appears to be a crusade for public acceptance of the modern versions in accordance with the plans laid down at the Council of Trent and modified at the Vatican II Council, and now being put into practice by the United Bible Society - the Bible Society wing of the ecumenical World Council of Churches?

We wonder if any Seventh-day Adventist noticed the danger in this eclectic approach to selecting doctrinal texts; for just as most modern translators adopt an eclectic approach to the text

which best suits their purpose, so with the plethora of versions available it is now possible to search for a text that translates a particular verse of Scripture to suit a particular doctrinal belief.

Maxwell did just that - he could hardly do otherwise and successfully uphold the doctrines of his church! Just one example should show the utter inconsistency of such an approach.

We have noted how Seventh-day Adventists have some unique beliefs. One which their pioneers worked out from their study of the King James Version concerns the state of man in death. They believe that death is like a sleep from which the dead are resurrected bodily at Christ's second coming (1 Thessalonians 4:13-16). In accordance with Ecclesiastes 9:5: *"The dead know not anything"* and Job 14:21: *"His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not"*, the dead of all ages still lie "sleeping" in the grave awaiting the resurrection day.

Is it not surprising then, that in the chapter, *"Shall we Meet our Loved Ones Again?"*, Maxwell kept well clear of the Revised Standard Version and stuck entirely to the KJV. Had he quoted Job 19:25, 26 from the RSV it would have been very embarrassing for this text reflects the belief of H. E. Fosdick, a leading radio preacher of the National Council of Churches which sponsored the RSV. Fosdick is reported to have bluntly declared:

"I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh"
(Ritchie, *"Why We Reject the National Council Bible"*, p 16).

Just what does the Revised Standard Version say?

"For I know that my Redeemer lives, and at last He will stand upon the earth; and after my skin has thus been destroyed, then without my flesh I shall see God" (1957 Edition Published by Thomas Nelson, Edinburgh. Emphasis supplied).

Whatever happened to the bodily resurrection? No, that text would never do. So Maxwell wisely stuck to the King James

Version which is supportive of his belief, yet flatly contradicting the RSV. The KJV says:

"And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God" (See "Your Bible and You", p 341).

Pastor Arthur Maxwell would have been wiser had he not played around with modern versions at all, let alone patronise the RSV and thus elevate it to a position of equality with the KJV.

It is not as though he and his Seventh-day Adventist publishers had not been warned, especially regarding the depraved nature of the Revised Standard Version; for no sooner had it arrived on the market than there was an outcry from Evangelical Fundamentalists. Articles protesting the RSV spontaneously appeared in such magazines as the "Sunday School Times", "Moody Monthly", "Christian Life", "Action" and "Eternity Magazine", while lecturers denouncing the new version sprang into action in numerous parts of the United States of America.

One theme was predominant among the protests - the pedigree of the RSV. It was sponsored by the National Council of Churches in America, which in its earlier form, the Federal Council of Churches, had been suspected by United States Naval Intelligence of being a subversive organisation with Socialist ideals (H.G. Ritchie, "Why We Reject the National Council Bible", p 9).

One of the Council-sponsored preachers, Dr E. S. Jones, showed a propensity to mix politics with the gospel - a trend which has characterised much of the Council's history:

"When the Western world was floundering in an unjust and uncompetitive order ... God reached out and put His hand on Russian Communists to produce a juster [sic] order and to show a recumbent church what it has missed in its own gospel" (ibid pp 9, 10).

Among the revisers of the RSV we find quite an assortment of

what we might call critical liberal modernists. Their rejection of the Received Text is clearly revealed in the Preface to their "Revision":

"The King James Version of the New Testament was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying" (Preface, 1957 Edition).

Such an attitude reveals the "revisers" hopeless infatuation with the Roman Catholic line which has been debunked through documentation presented in the book you are now reading. It is quite unworthy of the Protestant heritage under which the majority of the revisers sheltered and gained their living. They failed to recognise that had there been no Received Text, such as used by Tyndale and the King James Version translators, there would be no Protestant denominations in which they could masquerade as believers.

It is not surprising then that we find others of their fraternity exposing their traitorous intentions:

"The leaders of the [RSV] committee are active in the ecumenical movement, the World Council of Churches, which desires to include the Roman Catholics, and have a 'one world church'. All this fits into a pattern" (Carl McIntire, "The New Bible, Why Christians Should Not Accept It", Second Ed. p 21).

That the revisers had indeed succeeded in producing an ecumenical Bible is verified by an article by priest Bernard Orchard in a popular Roman Catholic Weekly:

"The most recent and best (translation) in the English-speaking world is the Revised Standard Version which in 1957 was brought to completion by the careful revision of the deuterocanonical books, roughly speaking identical with the Protestant apocrypha. The result is a scholarly rendering of Scripture which is a delight to read and with very little editing could be made entirely acceptable to English-speaking Catholics"

("The Commonweal", October 9, 1959, p 48).

As if such warnings were not sufficient to alert the Seventh-day Adventist Church to the modernistic-cum-Roman nature of the RSV, there appeared in 1953 a particular warning aimed specifically at Adventists by none other than the son of B.G. Wilkinson, Dr Rowland F Wilkinson. Three editions of his pamphlet: **"The New Revised Standard Version of the Bible"** appeared in that year alone, all emanating from Takoma Park, Washington, where the Headquarters of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was located.

Wilkinson's pamphlet caused quite a stir among Adventists as, one by one, he singled out corrupted texts which generally impinge on the Protestant faith and Seventh-day Adventism in particular. (For further information see "The Comparison of Texts" in Chapter twenty-seven).

In June 1960, Dr Rowland Wilkinson brought out an amplified edition of his pamphlet. His writings revealed an insight into Rome's strategy and the background of the RSV which would have done his father proud:

"A religious revolution is now shaping up in Western Christendom. The world ecumenical movements in Protestantism and Catholicism recognise that to unite there must be a mutually acceptable Bible" (p 3).

And how right subsequent events have proved him to be! Dr Wilkinson went on to demonstrate the incompatibility of the ecumenical Bible with the King James Version by quoting Dr Luther Weigle, Chairman of the Revised Standard Version Revision Committee who while addressing a capacity audience of religious leaders on September 30, 1952 in Washington said in effect:

"That you cannot use the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version together. It will bring in confusion; use one or the other. (Of course he recommended the RSV.)" (ibid).

But far from heeding such warnings, it seems that the Seventh-day Adventist Church had enjoyed its little excursion into the realm of ecumenical modernism. Within three years, the services of Arthur Maxwell's son, A. Graham Maxwell, were enlisted by the editor of its public outreach journal, the prestigious *"Signs of the Times"*. The May 1969 issue asked the title question: *"Can We Trust Modern Bible Versions?"* Maxwell told the public:

"You can trust the modern versions. Read as many as you can" (p 31).²⁰

By this time, the British and Foreign Bible Society and the United Bible Society had amended their constitutions to include the Apocrypha in some versions and were enjoying the fruits of Vatican II Council in the form of interconfessional co-operation.

What dangerous advice the Seventh-day Adventist Church was giving to the Societies potential customers! *"Read as many as you can"* (and get thoroughly confused!). Surely, the *"People of the Bible"* were now well on the way to forsaking the Bible of the Reformation from which they had worked out their own particular beliefs! Certainly they had disregarded previous

²⁰ One cannot help but wonder if Maxwell would now extend this advice to include the New International Version (NIV), which is now being vigorously promoted by his church. If so, he would have to change his belief in what his church calls the Investigative Judgment which, according to its teaching corresponds to the yearly atonement made by the High Priest in the Most Holy part of the earthly sanctuary. From their very inception, Adventists have claimed, according to their interpretation of the time prophecy of Daniel 8:14, that Christ commenced His priestly role of cleansing the Heavenly Sanctuary (atonement) by moving into the Most Holy Place in Heaven in 1844. Yet, according to the NIV and the New KJV, Christ went straight into the Most Holy Place at the time of His ascension:

"But He entered the Most Holy Place once and for all by His own blood, having obtained redemption" (Hebrews 9:12 NIV).

It is probably no coincidence that the NIV is being acclaimed and vigorously promoted by Adventists, for a large section of their scholars no longer believe that 1844 has any relevance to Christ's Heavenly Ministry.

warnings of their church against the uncompromising and consistent efforts of the papacy to make the United States a Roman Catholic Country.

During the years 1909 to 1912, Seventh-day Adventists had published: "The Protestant Magazine". In the issue dated Second Quarter, 1911 an article captioned: "A Remarkable Document" described as *"the Roman Catholic Confession publicly prescribed and propounded to Protestants in Hungary and Germany on their reception into communion with Rome"* (Circa 1673). Part of that Confession which defies God's warnings of eternal damnation for those who add and take away from His Word (**Revelation 22:18, 19**) reads thus:

"We confess that the Pope has the power of changing Scripture and of adding to it, and taking from it, according to his will" (Cited, "The Protestant Magazine", p 106).

The following year an editorial in The Protestant Magazine astutely observed:

"The Protestant reformation of the sixteenth century was an organised movement to set aside the authority of the popes, councils and tradition, and to return to the unadulterated teaching of Holy Scripture. The present partial failure of Protestantism is due to the repudiation of this fundamental feature of that movement" (ibid p 293).

Fortunately, by the 'seventies, Adventists were still taking such Protestant warnings seriously. Maxwell's advice was largely ignored as Seventh-day Adventist congregations clung tenaciously to their beloved King James Version.

Chapter Twenty-Six

Rome's Little Helper

It is historically demonstrable that denominational apostasy usually comes from the top. It is the result of organisational heresy which filters through its employees to the church congregations. Furthermore, it is a fact that such changes come slowly, for time and funerals are an integral part of the process.

It should never be forgotten that the term "apostasy" means a turning away from a position previously espoused. Therefore, when we speak of "Apostate Protestantism", we are referring to churches that have turned their back on the Reformation and have, or are going back to the "Mother Church" - Rome.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church has used this term ever since its inception to describe the decline in Protestantism generally. Few realised that by the mid-twentieth century the process was well under way within their own denomination!

A few people had pondered the increasing efforts to replace the King James Bible with the National Council of Churches Revised Standard Version. Its failure to be accepted by Adventist congregations defused any serious attempt to probe the real purpose behind the introduction of those modern versions, which of course was an attempt to provide Biblical support for a developing conspiracy to lead "The Truly Protestant Church" back into the arms of Rome.²¹

²¹ Said L.E. Froom, Secretary of the general Conference Ministerial Association, in the official SDA Church magazine, Review and Herald: "We see that the Seventh-day Adventists are truly Protestant, in taking the prophecies

Ever since their fledgling church had published its views on "The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan", back in 1887, Seventh-day Adventism had gained the particular attention of the Papacy. The book itself was proscribed.²² No wonder! Its author, Ellen G. White, a convert to Adventism from the Methodist Church, made it quite plain that Protestantism in America was imperilled by Roman Catholic action. In a chapter titled: "The Aims of the Papacy" she wrote:

Protestants have tampered with and patronised popery; they have made compromises and concessions which papists themselves are surprised to see, and fail to understand. Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism, and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty" (P 566).

She continued:

"The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honour is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty, and slew the saints of the Most High.

"The papacy is just what prophecy declared that she would be, the apostasy of the latter times" [2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4] (p 571).

of the Bible from 'the Bible and the Bible only'" (Sept 23, 1948, p 10).

Further evidence of Adventists genuine protest against Roman Catholicism is their refusal to worship on the day set apart by Rome - "the venerable day of the Sun".

²² Proscribe - to denounce and condemn as dangerous, to prohibit.

The book, "Great Controversy" was an outstanding success. With numerous reprints and editions still coming off the press, it must have sent its message to millions and is credited with bringing more people into the Adventist faith than any other book.

Because of this book it is alleged by the reformed Jesuit priest Dr Alberto Rivera that the Papacy took the Seventh-day Adventist Church seriously as a truly Protestant organisation and therefore targeted it for infiltration and subversion. ("Alberto", p 28).

But a group of Protestant Christians who perceive that they have a Biblical injunction to take God's "judgment hour message" to a doomed world are not easily diverted from their goal. The rise of Protestantism amidst the ever present threat of persecution and annihilation had driven this fact home to Rome - and the lesson had been well and truly learned; hence the Council of Trent (1545 to 1563) at which the Jesuit schemes of infiltration and internal subversion were adopted.

Since then the Jesuits have shown themselves masters in the art of seduction and subversion, a technique which relies on the frailties of human nature.

A sober warning was issued to members of a General Conference Committee of Seventh-day Adventists in the year 1903, by a committee member, Dr P.T. Magan. At this time a committee was reframing the organisational procedures of the General Conference enabling it to govern in a hierarchal manner resembling that of the Roman Catholic Church.²³ Magan Said:

²³ In a letter of censure written by A.T. Jones to General Conference President, A.G. Daniels, dated January 26, 1906, dealing with the change in the Constitution in 1903, Jones summed up his feelings thus:

"The Seventh-day Adventist denomination is more like the Catholic Church than is any other Protestant church in the world" (Meyers, "With Clouk and Dugger", p 73).

(Jones had been editor of the SDA religious liberty magazine, the "American Sentinel" and was regarded as the Denomination's most prominent public advocate of religious liberty. SDA Commentary, Vol. 10, p 634).

I have always felt that the hardest place that any man could be put in his life is to have to stand conscientiously opposed to what the majority of his brethren believe to be right. To me it has always appeared to be a much easier thing to stand in a position of opposition to the world, for your faith, than to have to face your brethren for your faith" (Cited in "Watchman, What of the Night", (XXVI - 2 (93) p 4).

This is a human frailty which has been exploited to the full by Rome and, as we shall now see has, according to the ex Jesuit Dr Alberto Rivera, met with outstanding success in the muting of Adventism's perceived role in preaching the "everlasting gospel" (See **Revelation 14:6-11**). In his book "**Alberto**", Rivera tells how he was one of many young seminarians trained by the Jesuits to infiltrate Protestant institutions. He claims:

"The first Protestant groups they [Jesuits] moved on were the 7th day Adventists [sic] and the Full Gospel Business Men", (p 28).

Such claims help provide a rational explanation for the otherwise inexplicable conduct of certain leaders whose actions appear more in keeping with the role of "*false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves*" of which Christ had warned His church (Matthew 7:15; Mark 13:22).

Dr Rivera has also written of the way in which Rome has carried out her plans (as formulated at the Council of Trent) to subvert Protestantism through what he calls the "Alexandrian cult":

"Today in many Bible colleges, professors who are in the Alexandrian cult are constantly altering the King James Bible with the Greek and English versions of the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. Naturally the students lose confidence in the Bible and lack power when they become preachers" ("Sabotage", p 30).

It follows then, that if Rivera is correct in his claim that the Seventh-day Adventist Church had been substantially infiltrated by Rome, we should expect that much of the Adventist administration and the academics whom it employs would be avid promoters of the modern versions. Let us see!

As the decade of the sixties was drawing to a close, it became evident to the more discerning Seventh-day Adventist that there was much more to the fad for modern versions than the wish to be seen to be in line with *"reverent scholarship"*. For instance, when the Ministerial Secretary of the Australasian Division of Seventh-day Adventists, Pastor L.C. Naden was appraised of the RSV, he immediately reacted by circularising the ministry, warning them of its pedigree and its pitfalls. But it was not long before a young man by the name of Desmond Ford was appointed head of theology at the Seventh-day Adventist's main ministerial training centre in Australia. He had spent quite some time training overseas and had picked up quite a bit of the *"reverent scholarship"*, part of which was his predilection for the National Council of Church's Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

He wrote a thesis which was published under the title of *"Daniel"* but his interpretation of prophecy was at variance with historic Adventism. In fact, he went for the futuristic interpretation of prophecy invented by the Jesuit Ribera which lets the papacy off the beastly hook of Revelation. Throughout his book, Ford used the RSV to support his position and no more objections to the use of the RSV were heard from the ministerial staff!²⁴

At that time, many Adventist academics and even some administrative leaders were vigorously pushing what was soon to be known as the *"New Theology"*. In the interests of peace and unity, and acquiescent attitude to the new teachings began

²⁴ Although the Australian Division of SDA's later abjectly exonerated Ford, he was eventually fired at the insistence of the General Conference in Washington. Much of his heretical teaching dominates the ministry in Australia to this day.

to develop among leaders who compromised their principles - a failing which was to characterise the church's rapid acceleration towards Protestant impotency.

But such enthusiasm for corrupted Scripture was not yet shared by the laity. Changes in the pews came slowly. As young Seventh-day Adventist pastors introduced the modern versions into their pulpits, many of the congregations resented the intrusion. In the October 1982 edition of *"The Ministry"* magazine, issued at the Seventh-day Adventist headquarters in Washington, there appeared an article by Elder Charles Case under the title: *"Use the Bible Your People Use"*. In the same article appeared the findings of a "Ministry" survey which indicated that an overwhelming majority of church members in North America wished that their pastor would stick to the King James Version.

Probably, a similar situation existed in Australia and New Zealand, for a veritable barrage of poorly documented articles upholding certain modern versions as superior to the KJV were appearing in the official church paper, *"The Australasian Record"*.

Simultaneously, and ever increasing number of church writers were using modern versions. The Sabbath School Lesson Quarterlies, published by the General Conference for its world Bible study program, decreasingly used the KJV as authority. Very significantly, its *"Sabbath School Lessons"* began to drop the traditional pattern of systematic study of doctrine in favour of a decidedly timorous approach to Scripture.

Implementing this radical change was the almost complete introduction of modern versions into the church's significantly large educational system - from its primary school to tertiary theological training. And, all this, in spite of the results of the survey published in its official church journal!

Such "meritorious" conduct did not escape the notice of Rome and her ecumenical lackeys. Was the Seventh-day Adventist Church now sufficiently within the ecumenical fold to have its co-operation in the translation of interconfessional Bibles? Apparently it was! The October 1985 *"Quarterly Record"* of

the Trinitarian Bible Society documents Adventism's new found dimension in ecumenism:

"The work of the Bible Society (United Bible Society) acquired a new dimension with the setting up of a consultative committee made up of three representatives from the Roman Catholic, the Anglican and Seventh-day Adventist churches. This committee will supervise the translation, reproduction and distribution in the Seychelles" ("United Bible Society Report", 1984).²⁵

The laity were still not impressed. Lagging behind and failing to celebrate the interconfessional exploits of their adventurous administrators, they would soon be made to see what was good

²⁵ A decade later the SDA Church in the South Pacific Division proudly announces its current ecumenical activities. Writing of the translation of the N.T. into the ChiLanji language in Zambia which began in 1990, we read in **"The Record"**:

"The project is interdenominational and involves Baptist, Seventh-day Adventist and Roman Catholic Churches" (**"Record"**, May 1, 1993 p 5).

An indication of Rome's remarkable success with her interconfessional brainwashing of Adventism is revealed in a most unlikely New Zealand publication, **"New Zealand Truth and TV Extra"**. Featured on the front page were the headlines: **"Kiwi Church Cranks in Pope Smear"**. (The "Cranks" turned out to be SDA lay people who had emulated the spirit of the original **"Protestant Magazine"** editors early this century).

According to **"Truth"** a paper called the **"Protestant"** had recently been circulated throughout New Zealand. Although the message, like that of its name sake was distinctly Adventist Protestant in nature, it failed to please the Adventist hierarchy in NZ. Pastor Larry Laredo from the Adventist Headquarters in Auckland publicly distanced his Church from the "underground" publication by allowing himself to be photographed in the act of tearing up the **"Protestant"**. David Ross, a spokesman for Catholic Communications, clearly revealed his church's perception of its success in hoodwinking Adventist administrators through the ecumenical process when he was reported as saying:

"The Protestant paper is an example of bigotry by a few Adventists which will not upset the ecumenical relationship being developed between Catholics and Seventh-day Adventists" (**"Truth"**, October 16, 1992).

for them.

The coup de grace came in 1985 in the form of "**The Seventh-day Adventist Hymnal**". This is the first time that the contents of any hymn book has received the imprimatur of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists by the incorporation of its name in the title.

After voting for this hymnal, mostly sight unseen, church members were in for a real shock. Aside from some hymns that were distinctly Roman Catholic in sentiment and even liturgy, it contained an extensive section of Scriptures for corporate reading as well as a smaller section for corporate prayers and canticles - a new and radical departure for an historically conservative Protestant church.

In view of the craven desire of the church leadership to promote modern versions, it should not be surprising to find that the Hymnal Committee and the hierarchy which supported them, took this opportunity to coerce Adventist congregations into mouthing Scriptures which they had hitherto rejected and ignored. Members were shocked to find that this hymnal slighted their beloved King James Bible by practically ignoring it! Out of some 224 Scripture Readings and prayers intended for corporate worship, taken from eight Bible versions, the KJV was relegated to a very poor seventh place in frequency of use. It was utilised **fourteen times only!**

The Roman Catholic Jerusalem Bible came in second place being used thirty-eight times - nearly three times more than the KJV! The New International Version topped the list, being used sixty-eight times! One reading, No 852, purporting to be a rendition of Psalm 63:1-5 is nothing more than an anonymous paraphrase!

Indicative of the Roman influence behind the selection of these readings is the use of liturgical terminology which this hymnbook has introduced to Adventist worship. No 833, taken from Isaiah 6 carries the label: "*The Sanctus*"; No 835 from Luke 1, titled: "*The Song of Mary*" carries the notation, "*Commonly called The Magnificat*"; and No 836, also from Luke 1, is "*Commonly called the Benedictus*". All three are

New King James Version renditions. No 837, a rendition of a portion of Luke 2 from the Jerusalem Bible, is *"Commonly called The Nunc Dimittis"*.

The few times the King James Version is used is when very well known and oft repeated texts are quoted. Presumably, the Selection Committee was afraid of offending reader's sensibilities by trying to rephrase ingrained memory verses. If so, the Committee failed the test of consistency by quoting John 3:16 from the Jerusalem Bible (No 782). And again, in No 730, they destroyed a beautiful message which announces God's comprehensive plan of salvation for all mankind by quoting Luke 2:14 from the NIV. This rendition promotes a selective type of gospel with which the Roman Church undoubtedly agrees - *"Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to men on whom His favour rests"*.

Another reading selected from the NIV ("Zondervan", 1978) which not only carries overtones of Catholicism, but is positively preposterous, is to be found in No 756. Here, David is made to say in Psalm 51:5: *"Surely I have been a sinner from birth and sinful from the time my mother conceived me"*. It is on this assumption that all babies are born sinners that Rome hastens to baptise as soon as possible after birth. But this rendition goes further; all are sinners from the moment of conception! But, by the time the SDA Hymnal was published in 1985 the publishers of the New International Version had seen fit to delete this outrage: *"and in sin did my mother conceive me"* ("Zondervan", 1984).

The Biblical definition of sin is found in 1 John 3:4. *"For sin is the transgression of the law"*. In No 790, Adventists are asked to repeat the RSV's definition of sin: *"Sin is lawlessness"*. (And, so is exceeding the speed limit. Is that sin?)

What a mix up! Far from the ludicrous image of a sinful, lawless foetus, depicted in their hymnal, the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary prepared in the 'fifties gives a perfectly rational exposition of Psalm 51:5. On page 755 of Vol. 3 we read: *"David recognises that children inherit natures with propensities to evil"*.

This fully accords with David's declaration in the KJV: *"Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me"*.

It is on this obfuscation of God's plain definition of sin that the "new theology" of apostate Protestantism is predicated! The logical conclusion to this postulate will inevitably support Rome's dogma of the Immaculate Conception with its Mary Worship. How else could Christ be incarnated through humanity and, yet be born sinless! (according to Rome's definition of sin).

It would be difficult to imagine a more striking vindication of Dr Rivera's claim regarding Rome's infiltration of Seventh-day Adventism than the above recitation of behaviour which must surely merit the title of *Rome's Little Helper!*

Chapter Twenty-Seven

Fruits of AntiChrist

The story of the Battle of the Bibles would remain little more than one of historical interest unless its relevance to present day Christianity can be demonstrated. There are those who love to assure us that textual variations have little or no bearing on basic Christian doctrine. If this be so, then we can only conclude that the leading contenders for the revision of the King James Version failed miserably in their expectations; for the leading agitator for revision, who also became chairman of the New Testament Committee of Revision, made no secret of his desire for change, meaning doctrinal change. Said Bishop Ellicott:

"Here our duty is obvious. Faithfulness and loyalty to God's truth, require that the correction should be made unhesitatingly" (Ellicott, "Considerations", p 88).

Accordingly, we shall here offer some comparisons of texts from five Bible versions "against" that of the King James Version. In the process, it will be noticed that Ellicott's expectations have been realised - not only in the Revised Version, but progressively more so in subsequent versions.

The five versions chosen are representative of changes in translations approximating the period between the publication of the Douay and Jerusalem Versions, both of which are Roman Catholic Bibles. This is the period covering roughly the era of the development of Protestantism until its virtual demise following Vatican II Council (1962 to 1965). The reader may compare other versions with this fairly representative selection.

The versions selected for this exercise of comparison with the KJV are:

1. The Douay Version (1914 Edition) published and revised from the Rheims (1582) and the Douay (1609) version.
2. The Revised Version (RV 1897).
3. The Revised Standard Version (RSV published by Thomas Nelson 1957).
4. The Jerusalem Bible (JB 1971).
5. The New International Version (NIV 1978).

It is here pertinent to note some ways in which attacks on Scripture are launched. By injecting seeds of doubt by means of marginal or foot notes; by changes which effect the meaning either subtly or by outright contradictions; or by omission of words, phrases, sentences and whole verses.

We shall group these attacks on the Received Text under broad doctrinal headings and list the Scriptural comparisons in the order in which they appear in the Bible. This is by no means an attempt at a detailed analysis, but it will be sufficient to demonstrate that important doctrines are effected. When any of these five versions do not appear in our analysis, it is because it is in thought-agreement with the KJV.

The doctrines with which we will be here concerned are:

1. Messianic Prophecies.
2. Christ's divinity and Creatorship.
3. Christ's miraculous birth.
4. Christ's incarnation into true humanity.
5. The gospel of salvation.
6. Christ's resurrection, ascension and second advent.

Group 1. Attacks on the Messianic Prophecies

Undoubtedly the greatest attacks on the Holy Scriptures have been directed against Jesus Christ as the eternal, uncreated Son of God Who was incarnated in our flesh that He might triumph

over sin in our nature and conquer death.

The record of this world shattering achievement is known as the "*Gospel*" or the "*Good News*". Like it or not, the civilised world honours this event every time the date is recorded, by relating it to the year of our Lord - Anno Domini (AD).

Yet, it has never been in the interests of the Satan-led Gnostics and the Jewish hierarchy that the Biblical predictions of Christ's first advent be obscured in order that Christ be not identified as the Messiah. (The first quotation for each Scripture considered will be from the KJV).

Genesis 12:3

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed".

We see that this blessing would come through the lineage of Abraham and be made available to all people. Protestants and Roman Catholics have traditionally seen this text as a promise of the Messiah.

RSV "*And by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves*".

Here we are given a useless self-blessing (as epitomised in the history of Israel during the Christian era).

JB "*Bless themselves by you*"

A senseless rendition!

Genesis 49:10

"The sceptre shall not pass from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shilo come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be"

Douay "*The sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah, nor a ruler from his thigh, till he come that he is to be sent: and he shall be the expectation of the nations*".

RV Note "*Till he come to Shilo, having the obedience of the peoples*".

RSV, JB and NIV "*Until he comes to whom it belongs*".

In ancient times, the sceptre was a sign of authority. When on

the throne, monarchs would rest it between their knees. Here we are told that Judah would retain leadership among the tribes until the coming of Shilo who would take over the leadership of Israel. Hence we here have a Messianic prophecy which has been progressively blunted and garbled from the time of the appearance of the Douay onward.

Isaiah 7:14

"Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel".

RV Note and RSV *"Behold a young woman shall conceive and bear a son..."*.

JB *"the maiden is with child"*.

Notice how the ambiguous, doubt fostering note which was inserted into the RV to placate the Unitarian, Dr Vance Smith, is developed into a textual omission of the virgin birth in the RSV.

Jeremiah 31:22

"For the LORD hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man".

RSV *"For the Lord has created a new thing on the earth; a woman protects a man"*.

JB *"For Yahweh is creating something new on earth: the Woman sets out to find her husband again"*.

NIV Note *"A woman will go about [seeking]; or will protect a man"*.

Early Christian expositors, (and Augustine) are almost unanimous in attributing this *"new thing"* to Jesus being encompassed in Mary's womb. Notice that while the Douay did not tamper with this text, yet Rome's interconfessional Jerusalem Bible joins in with the modern versions in postulating a ridiculous concept. What is new about a woman seeking or protecting a man? Even Rahab did that!

Zechariah 9:9

"Behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass".

Here we have the forecast of Christ, the Saviour, triumphantly entering Jerusalem while humbly riding on an ass (Matthew 21:5-9). Now, note the progressive elimination of Christ's role as Saviour, as introduced by the doubtful note in the RV, which eventually is adopted by the JB

RV Note *"He is just and having 'saved' or 'victory'".*

RSV *"Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he".*

JB *"See now, your king comes to you; he is victorious, he is triumphant, humble and riding on a donkey".*

This prophecy of a coming Saviour is missing.

Matthew 27:35

"And they crucified him and parted his garments, casting lots; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet" (See Psalm 22:18).

RV *"And when they had crucified him, they parted his garments among them, by casting lots".*

RSV *"They divided his garments among them by casting lots".*

JB *"They shared out his clothing by casting lots".*

NIV *"They divided up his cloths by casting lots".*

Only the Douay agrees with the KJV by referring to the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy.

Mark 15:28

"And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors".

RV and RSV This verse is omitted but recorded in a note.

JB and NIV The entire verse is omitted.

Group 2. Attacks on Christ's Divinity, His Eternal Pre-Existence and His Creatorship.

Daniel 3:25

"Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the

Son of God".

RV *"and the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods".*

RSV *"and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods".*

JB and NIV *"and the fourth looks like a son of the gods".*

The translators of the KJV and the Douay reflect the early Christian view that the fourth person was the second person of the Godhead. In doing so, they are acknowledging Christ's pre-existence. The above four versions which fail to make this point ignore the context where Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the superiority of Israel's God (Daniel 3:26-29; 4:2). They are in line with Origenism.

Micah 5:2

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, **from everlasting**".

RV Note *"whose goings forth are from of old, or from ancient days".*

RSV *"whose origin is from of old, from ancient days".*

JB *"His origin goes back to the distant past, to the days of old".*

NIV *"whose origins are from of old, from ancient times".*

It will be noted that there is an eternity of difference between the terms: *"from everlasting"* and from: *"ancient of days"* or *"times"*. Again, the progression of error from the note in the RV to the later versions is obvious. Christ's everlasting co-existence in the Godhead is denigrated.

Matthew 27:54

"Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, **Truly this was the Son of God**".

RV Note and RSV *"Truly this was a son of God".*

JB *"In truth, this was a son of God".*

"A son of God" does not equate with "the Son of God". All believing Christians may become sons of God: "Beloved now are we the sons of God" (1 John 3:2).

NIV Note *"a Son of God".*

John 6:69

"And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God".

RV *"Thou art the Holy One of God".*

RSV, JB and NIV *"You are the Holy One of God".*

The translators of these four versions all avoid Peter's declaration that Jesus is *"that Christ"*, the Son of the living God. The term "Christ" or "anointed one" is synonymous with the Hebrew "Messiah". Neither translation makes the sense specific (or plainer as most publishers of modern versions claim) because such titles as the *"Holy One of God"* have been bestowed upon a variety of religious leaders, such as gurus, lamas, mullahs and popes.

Acts 8:37

"And he [Philip] answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God".

RV This verse is missing, but a note tells us that some ancient authorities "insert" verse 27.

RSV, JB and NIV All omit verse 27.

Note that this important declaration on the divinity of Christ in the KJV is upheld by Rome in the Douay but not in her later Jerusalem Bible.

Ephesians 3:9

And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ".

Douay *"And to enlighten all men that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God who created all things".*

We have noticed the inclination on the part of Rome to uphold the divinity of Christ in the Douay version. However, this admirable trait is subservient to the opportunity of appearing to support dogma - in this case, the priestly dispensing of the Mass and the "re-creation" of Christ in the form of a wafer.

RV *"hath been hid in God who created all things".*

RSV *"hidden for ages in God, who created all things".*

JB *"but also of explaining how the mystery is to be dispensed. Through all the ages, this has been kept hidden in God, the creator of everything".*

NIV *"was kept hidden in God, who created all things".*

None of the five versions attributes creatorship to Jesus Christ. If Christ is not the Creator, how can He be expected to create new hearts within us?

Ephesians 3:14

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ".

RV and RSV *"I bow my knees unto the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named".*

JB *"This, then, is what I pray, kneeling before the Father, from whom every family, whether spiritual or natural, takes its name".*

NIV *"For this reason I kneel before the Father, from whom the whole family in heaven and on earth derives its name".*

Once again we see the overriding desire of the modern translators to eliminate reference to the Sonship of Christ - even the Roman Jerusalem Bible, though the Douay got it right!

Hebrews 1:2

"[God], Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds;"

RV Note *"hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son ... through whom also He made the ages".*

RSV *"He has spoken to us by a Son through whom He created the world".*

Notice how Gnosticism comes through in the revised versions. Paul's declaration of Christ's divine Sonship is missing, while the RV presents Christ as the creator of something intangible.

Group 3. Attacks on the Virgin Birth

Isaiah 7:14 has been cited in the section dealing with Messianic passages of Scripture and it is also applicable here. Now look at some attacks in the New Testament. Predictably, we should not expect the Douay Version to join in these attacks, yet, in keeping with Vatican II Council, Rome's interconfessional plans are evident in her Jerusalem Bible.

Matthew 1:25

"And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS".

RV *"and knew her not till she had brought forth a son".*

RSV *"But knew her not until she had borne a son".*

JB *"and, though he had not had intercourse with her, she gave birth to a son".*

NIV *"But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son".*

As a virgin, Mary's child must of necessity be a first-born, and the KJV and the Douay make this point. But the best the revisionists can do is to indicate that Joseph was not the father, thus leaving the possibility that some other man might have been the boy's father! Notice the emerging pattern of resemblance between the post-Vatican II Bibles - JB and NIV.

Luke 2:33

"And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him".

We note how the King James Version translators were careful to avoid naming Joseph as Jesus' father. Not so the following versions.

Douay *"And his father and mother were wondering at those things which were spoken concerning him".*

It would appear that Rome has here made a surprising

mistake. It is explained by B.G. Wilkinson who says: *"In preparing the Latin Bible, Jerome would gladly have gone all the way in transmitting to us the corruptions in the text of Eusebius, but he did not dare"* (*"Our Authorised Version Vindicated"*, p 48).

But in this case, Jerome must have been determined to support Origen and his Gnosticism, for Wilkinson cites **"Jerome against Helvidius"** to say that Helvidius accused Jerome of translating Luke 2:33 from corrupt Greek manuscripts (*ibid* p 48).

RV and RSV *"And his father and mother".*

JB *"As the child's father and mother stood there wondering at the things that were being said about him".*

NIV *"The child's father and mother marvelled".*

John 3:16

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life".

RSV *"For God so loved the world that He gave His only Son..."*

The omission of the term: *"begotten"* is entirely consistent with the Gnostic philosophy of the RSV revisers who shunned the supernatural. *"Only begotten"* comes from two Greek words meaning *"alone"* and *"I am born"*, thus signifying Christ's lack of an earthly father. That the omission is deliberate, there can be no doubt, as witness John 1:14,18; John 3:18 and 1 John 4:9.

JB *"God loved the world so much that he gave his only Son".*

NIV *"For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son".*

Again, we see the Jerusalem Bible and the NIV pairing up, except that a note in the NIV admits the omission: *"Or God's only begotten Son"*.

Group 4. Against Christ's Incarnation and True Humanity

Acts 2:30

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, **according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne**"

Here we have Peter reminding the believers that Christ's incarnation through the flesh (of David's line) had been both promised and fulfilled (2 Samuel 7:12-16).

In 1 John 4:3 God has warned that: *"every spirit that confesseth not that Christ is come in the flesh is not of God"*. Notice how the following versions fail to identify the "One" who came in the flesh as Christ.

Douay *"that of the fruit of his loins one should sit upon his throne"*.

RV *"that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne"*.

RSV *"he would set one of his descendants upon his throne"*.

JB *"to make one of his descendants succeed him on the throne"*.

NIV *"he would place one of his descendants upon his throne"*.

1 Timothy 3:16

"And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God** was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory".

Douay *"great is the mystery of Godliness, which was manifest in the flesh, was justified in the spirit..."*.

RV *"He who was manifested in the flesh..."*.

RSV *"Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh..."*.

JB *"Without any doubt, the mystery of our religion is very deep indeed. He was made visible in the flesh..."*.

NIV *"He appeared in a body..."*.

All five versions fail to identify who or what appeared in the flesh. The NIV demolishes the doctrine of the incarnation by saying: *"He appeared in a body"*. We may well ask, who appeared in a body? Don't we all! But how many gods have been *"manifest in the flesh"*?

Hebrews 2:16

"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham".

It will be noted in the KJV that the words: *"him the nature"* have been supplied, indicating a problem with the Greek text. But whereas this translation makes sense within the context of verse seventeen, which outlines the credentials of a high priest, other translators have succeeded in making it meaningless.

Douay *"For nowhere doth he take hold of the angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold"*.

RV *"For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham"*.

RSV *"For surely it is not with angels that he is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham"*.

NIV *"For surely it is not angels he helps, but Abraham's descendants"*.

Notice the progressive degeneration of the text.

1 John 4:3

"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now is already in the world".

Douay *"And every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God"*.

Here we have further evidence of Rome tampering with Holy Scripture - in this case, a senseless rendition designed to avoid evidence that could implicate her as the antichrist. Bishop Simpson in his **"Yale Lectures on Preaching"**, says: *"The Romanists have been trying to get the human nature of Christ as far away from our humanity as possible and hence have*

taught the Immaculate Conception of Mary".

With such teaching, Christ could not have inherited any sinful tendencies from Mary and hence did not come in the flesh of fallen humanity.

RV *"and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God; and this is the spirit of the antichrist".*

RSV *"and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This spirit is of the antichrist".*

NIV *"but every spirit which does not acknowledge Jesus is not from God. this is the spirit of antichrist".*

Not one of these four renditions confess that *"Jesus is come in the flesh"*.

Group 5. Attacks on the Gospel - Salvation

Matthew 9:13

"I will have mercy and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, **but sinners to repentance**".

Here, Christ enunciates a basic pre-requisite to salvation - first an acknowledgment of our sinful state, and then a repentance that turns us away from sin. This process of repentance does not seem to be understood by Rome.

Douay *"For I am not come to call the just, but sinners".*

RV and RSV *"I came not to call the righteous, but sinners".*

JB *"I did not come to call the virtuous, but sinners".*

NIV *"I came not to call the righteous but sinners".*

Not one of these renditions speak of repentance.

Matthew 18:3

"Except ye be **converted**, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven".

RV *"Except ye turn, and become as little children".*

RSV *"Except you turn and become like children".*

JB *"Except you change and become like little children".*

NIV *"Unless you change and become like little children".*

"Conversion" holds not only the thought of turning about, forsaking a present course, but has religious and spiritual

connotations which these versions all choose to ignore.

Matthew 18:11

"For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost".

RV, RSV, JB and NIV The whole verse is missing because Westcott and Hort rejected it, but the Douay having preceded them got it right.

Mark 2:17

"They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance".

Douay *"For I came not to call the just, but sinners"*.

RV and RSV *"I came not to call the righteous, but sinners"*.

JB *"I did not come to call the virtuous, but sinners"*.

NIV *"I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners"*.

Again, as in Matthew 9:13, all versions avoid mentioning "repentance".

Luke 2:14

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men".

The heavenly host announced to the world the beautiful news of salvation to men - a generic term encompassing the whole human race, without exception. But in the following renditions, this universal message of hope has been prostituted with a restricted application to a favoured class.

Douay *"Glory to God in the highest: and on earth peace to men of good will"*.

Over the centuries, the Roman Church has made it painfully clear whom she regards as not meriting good will.

RV *"And on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased"*.

RSV *"and on earth peace among men with whom He is pleased"*.

JB *"and peace to men who enjoy His favour"*.

NIV *"peace to men on whom His favour rests"*.

Such sentiments expressed in the modern versions could encourage the predestination philosophy of Calvin on which "Apartheid" is predicated.

John 6:47

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life".

RV *"He that believeth hath eternal life".*

RSV *"he who believes has eternal life".*

JB *"everybody who believes has eternal life".*

NIV *"he who believes has everlasting life".*

According to the above versions, belief in something unspecified will ensure eternal life! Like Hinduism or Buddhism?

1 Corinthians 5:7

"For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us".

Douay *"For Christ our pasch is sacrificed".*

RV *"For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ".*

RSV *"For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed".*

JB *"Christ, our passover, has been sacrificed".*

NIV *"For Christ, our Passover lamb, has been sacrificed".*

For those who are inclined to minimise the importance of the two missing words: "for us", it is here pertinent to quote B.G. Wilkinson: *"That Christ was sacrificed is an historical fact; that He was sacrificed "for us" is a doctrine and the very basis of which the Gospel rests. Take away the fact that he died for us, as the Revisers did in this text, and there is no Gospel left. The leading Revisers, in particular, Westcott and Hort, rejected the idea that Christ was our substitute and sacrifice" ("Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 193).*

Group 6. Against Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, and Second Advent

If there is one thing the Gnostics and Rationalists cannot

stomach, it is the fact of Christ's resurrection and ascension. It follows then that the doctrine of His second advent must be a nonsense to such unbelievers.

Matthew 24:3

"Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the **end of the world?**"

Douay *"And what shall be the sign of They coming and of the consummation of the world?"*

RV Note *"And what shall be the sign of Thy presence and of the consummation of the age?"*

RSV *"and what will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age?"*

NIV *"and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?"*

Not that all the above (except the Revised Version which relies on a note to inject uncertainty) are indefinite as to the precise nature of the event. *"The end of the age"* could refer to any of earth's historical periods, such as the age of Roman rule, the supremacy of an empire, or a social era.

Mark 16:9-20

"Now, when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene ...After that he appeared in another form unto two of them ... Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat ... So then after the Lord had spoken unto them he was received up into heaven, and sat at the right hand of God".

RV Note *"The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities omit from verse nine to the end".*

RSV Note The chapter ends with verse eight and verses nine to twenty are recorded in note .

NIV "The translators preface verses nine to twenty with the observation: *"The most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9-20"*.

If *"the most reliable manuscripts"* do not include these verses, then why include them in a note? The manuscripts which the

revisers incorrectly describe are the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus which, as we have seen, have at times been rejected by Rome as inferior to the Itala; hence it is fairly predictable that both the Douay and the Jerusalem Bibles should include these verses.

Luke 24:6

"He is not here but is risen; remember how he spake unto you when he was in Galilee".

RSV Note *"He is not here but is risen"* is confined to the footnote.

This omission reflects the belief of some members of the National Council of Churches, as epitomised by H.E. Fosdick who was against the resurrection (see page 148).

Luke 24:51

"And it came to pass, while he blessed them he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven".

RV Note "Some ancient authorities omit *"and was carried up into heaven"*."

RSV *"While he blessed them he parted from them"*.

Again, we have the RSV building on the doubts introduced by Westcott and Hort in the Revised Version.

Titus 2:13

"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ".

Douay *"Looking for the blessed hope and coming of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"*.

In this and following renditions of the text, nothing is said of Christ's expected literal return.

RV and RSV *"and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ"*.

JB *"while we are waiting in hope for the blessing which will come with the Appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ"*.

Alterations Favouring Roman Catholicism

Genesis 3:15

"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between they seed and her seed; it shall bruise they head, and thou shall bruise his heel".

This text has ever been recognised by Christians as the first Biblical promise of the Messiah. Here our first parents were told that the "*seed*" would feel the enmity of the serpent (Satan) who would inflict a non-lethal wound. But in contrast, the "*seed*" (Christ) would inflict a mortal wound to Satan's head.

The Mariolaters have corrupted this text by deflecting the credit for this victory away from Christ to Mary.

Douay *"she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel"*.

Matthew 3:2

"And saying, Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand".

Douay *"Do penance for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"*.

Here, and in most other passages of Scripture where repentance is mentioned, the Douay Version advocates penance in an endeavour to support the dogma of "*salvation by works*" (See in **Douay**, Ezekiel 18:30; Matthew 4:17; Matthew 12:41; Mark 6:12; Luke 13:3, 5; Luke 16:30; Acts 2:38; Revelation 3:3).

This is one of the corruptions that caused emerging Protestant England to look on the Rheims Douay Bible with revulsion.

By the time Rome adopted the ecumenical mode - some three and a half centuries later (Vatican II Council), she discontinued such abominations, as witness the Knox and Jerusalem Bibles. Rome will yield only if she perceives a greater gain.

1 Corinthians 11:29

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body".

RV *"For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh*

judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body".

RSV *"For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself".*

JB *"a person who eats and drinks without recognising the Body is eating and drinking his own condemnation".*

NIV *"For anyone who eats and drinks without recognising the body of the Lord eats and drinks judgment on himself".*

In all these versions here cited, not one uses the expression: *"unworthily"*. The inclusion of this word in the KJV (and Douay) indicates that there could be any number of causes other than *"not discerning the Lord's body"*. In fact, various causes could impair spiritual discernment of the emblem. The countless number of people burned at the Roman stakes accentuates the importance which Rome attaches to the dogma of *"Transubstantiation"*. The recognition of the wafer as the literal body of Christ is the only concern shown in these renditions.

Note also the substitution of *"judgment"* for *"damnation"*.

James 5:16

"Confess you faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed".

Douay *"Confess therefore your sins one to another: and pray one for another, that you may be saved".*

RV *"Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved".*

JB *"So confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another, and this will cure you".*

NIV *"Therefore confess your sins to each other and pray for each other so that you may be healed".*

Faults and sins are not the same. In the KJV, verse 15, *"sins"* is used correctly in the context of God forgiving sins. But in verse 16, *"faults"* is used in connection with human relationships. The Douay blatantly tries to justify the priestly confessional by introducing *"salvation"* into verse 16. Notice that the interconfessional Jerusalem Bible agrees with the modern versions by omitting *"salvation"*.

2 Peter 2:9

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished'.

RV *"and to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment".*

RSV *"and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment".*

NIV *"and to hold the unrighteous for the day of judgment, while continuing their punishment".*

It seems strange that the Roman Douay and Jerusalem Bibles do not go this far in upholding an intermediate state of punishment such as purgatory. Rather, they seem content to leave it to the so-called Protestant versions. However, the New Jerusalem Bible (1985) has yielded to interconfessional desires as has the New King James Version!

Revelation 13:18

"Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and the number is Six hundred three score and six".

It has been a source of strength among Waldenses and other Christians who have been persecuted by the Church of Rome, and later among early Protestants, to know that God has identified their persecutor as the "beast" of Revelation. The martyrs would not be impressed by the doubt-fostering revisionists whose cankerous suggestions infest some versions.

RV Note *"Some ancient authorities read, Six hundred and sixteen".*

RSV Note *"Other ancient authorities read six hundred and sixteen".*

JB Note *"Some commentators have claimed that 666 is the total of the number values of Nero Caesar".*

Dean Burgon has some pertinent and telling comments on this perversion. *"Not one ancient version advocates this reading",* but only one uncial and cursive copy. He claims that Iranaeus (170 AD) knew of these corruptions by rejected them saying

that 666 is, *"Found in all the best and oldest copies and is attested by men who saw John face to face"* ("The Revision revised", pp 135, 136).

It is hoped that all fair-minded readers will, after studying the foregoing brief analysis of Scriptural deviations, realise that **important Christian doctrines have been seriously undermined**. We have not attempted to examine the many seemingly minor alterations to Scripture that, on their own, do not appear to be important. But let us not be complacent, for Drs Westcott and Hort, on whose critical method of translation most of the modern translators rely, realised the importance of the cumulative impact of even seemingly innocuous changes in translation. Commenting on the work of the 1881 revisionists, Westcott declared:

"But the value of the revision is most clearly seen when the student considers together a considerable group of passages, which bear upon some article of the Faith. The accumulation of small details then produces its fuller effect. Points on which it might have seemed pedantic to insist in a single passage become impressive by repetition." (Westcott, "Some Lessons", p 184, emphasis supplied).

Such an insight into the thoroughness of the "scheme" entered into by Westcott, Hort and Ellicott, designed to tamper with articles of accepted faith, reflects on the probity of all those who engineered the fraud of "revision". Truly, it is axiomatic that dishonest enterprises must employ dishonest means. Despite the fact that the charter handed to the revisers stipulated that changes were to be limited to "plain and clear" errors, the finished revision brought forth a staggering 36,000 changes in the English of the KJV and close to 6,000 in the Greek Text.

Canon Cook had no doubts as to the origin of those changes:

"By far the greatest number of innovations, including those which give the severest shocks to our minds, are adopted on the authority of two manuscripts, or even

one manuscript, against the distinct testimony of all other manuscripts, uncial and cursive The Vatican Codex, ... sometimes alone, generally in accord with the Sinaitic, is responsible for nine-tenths of the most striking innovations in the Revised Versions" (Cook, "Revised Version", pp 227, 231; cited in "Our Authorised Bible Vindicated", pp 175, 176).

It should be a matter of great concern for all honest Christians that the vast majority of succeeding revisers have enthusiastically followed the fraudulent example of Westcott and Hort.

A quick glance over the foregoing analysis shows a decided trend on the part of modern versions to emulate and build upon the doubt fostering suggestions and depravations of the Revised Version.

Yet, another very significant observation is pertinent. Glancing back over the foregoing comparison of Scripture, one is struck by the frequent absence of conflict between the Douay and the King James Version, especially in those texts which deal with the divinity of Christ and His incarnation. Why is it that the Douay stays closer to the KJV than most later versions? Is it, as claimed by the Roman Church, because the translators of the KJV relied heavily on the Catholic Vulgate? The short answer is no! And, here are two reasons. First, let us hark back to the times of Constantine, Eusebius and Jerome, that have been discussed in Section two, Chapter fourteen.

Both the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus manuscripts are thought to be surviving copies of the fifty Bibles which Constantine commissioned Eusebius to produce. Being written on vellum (animal skins), and later being made redundant with the official adoption by Rome of Jerome's Latin Bible, it is not surprising that they have survived in isolation.

We have noted how Jerome was sensitive to the criticism of the Milan (Waldensian) scholars who used the Itala type Bible (later branded by Rome as the Waldensian Bible). This early Bible was known as the Latin Vulgate or popular Bible. As a

measure of the esteem in which the Itala (Vulgate) was held, even by the Roman clergy, let us be reminded of what the celebrated Augustine (354-430 AD) had to say:

"Now among translations themselves, the Italian (Itala) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice to clearness of expression" (**"Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers"**, [Christian Lit Ed] Vol. II p 542).

As noted in chapter fourteen, in the interests of professional credibility Jerome also consulted early Greek manuscripts (such as would have been available to Lucian), and so ended up with a Bible that was closer to the Itala than Constantine's Bible produced by Eusebius. This is not to say that Jerome's Bible did not contain error. It did, for it was a compromise! Today, his Bible could be described as an ecumenical version in the language of the common people.

However, it took centuries for Jerome's Bible to gain popularity and eventually it assumed the name first given to the Itala, "the Vulgate". Even so, a full millennium later, at a time when the return of Greek literature and learning were dispelling the gloom of the Dark Ages, notable Catholic scholars were still denigrating Jerome's Catholic Vulgate.

In 1583, while writing to a Jesuit, Dr Fulke mentioned that Bishop Lindanus had written a whole book on how he longed to have the

"errors, vices, corruptions, additions, detractions, mutilations, uncertainties, obscurities, pollutions, barbarisms and solecisms of the Vulgar Latin translation corrected and reformed".

He also quoted a monk, Isidarius Clarius, as saying that the Catholic Latin Vulgate was:

"full of errors, almost innumerable" (Fulke, **"Defence of Translations of the Bible"** (1583) p 62, cited in, **"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"**, p 49).

It was from this Latin Vulgate that the Douay Bible was translated into English (1609) in order to counter the English Protestant Bibles flowing from Tyndale's translation which relied on the Greek Testament of Erasmus. These Bibles were branded and burned by Rome as, "Waldensian Bibles" because they had a common pedigree. When in 1611 the King James Version appeared, it too had a pedigree similar to the "Waldensian Bibles" or the Itala, for they are all of the traditional Received Text line.

As the Rheims-Douay Bible (1582, 1609) was circulated in an attempt to counteract the "Waldensian Bibles", many differences were apparent. Yet, it did not contain the blatant discrepancies that would have existed had the Rheims Douay slavishly followed Constantine's Eusebius Bible.

But this is exactly what happened when in 1881 Westcott and Hort reverted to the Greek Text of Eusebius by using the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, for these are considered to be two surviving Constantine Bibles.

There is a second reason why the Douay Bible of today agrees more often with the KJV than with many of the modern versions. Let the Roman Catholics explain why:

"The version now in use has been so seriously altered that it can be scarcely considered identical with that which went by the name of the Douay Bible ... Although the Bibles in use at the present day by the Catholics of England and Ireland are popularly styled the Douay Version, they are most improperly called; they are founded with more or less alteration, on a series of revisions by Bishop Challoner in 1749-1752 ... The changes introduced by him are so considerable that, according to Cardinal Newman, they almost amounted to a new translation. So, also, Cardinal Wiseman wrote, 'to call it any longer the Douay or Rheimish Version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified until scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published. In nearly every case, Challoner's changes took the form approximating to the Authorised

Version'' ("The Catholic Encyclopedia", Article Douay Bible).

Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Here we have an implied admission by Rome that her Latin Vulgate is inferior to the Received Text. So, in an attempt to gain credibility in the English-speaking world, she was willing to modify what she has consistently claimed to be the true text!

We have noted the way in which revised versions have built on the doubts injected into the Revised Version by Westcott and Hort. Yet, amazingly, we later find the Roman Catholic Jerusalem Bible often adopting the errors of the RV and RSV thus placing itself at variance with the Douay!

To explain this, we must remember the crafty way in which the Roman Cardinals, Wiseman and Newman, brought about the so-called revision of the KJV. They let alleged Protestants do the odious work which they themselves, as open converts to Catholicism dare not undertake - namely, to insinuate the corrupt Bibles of Eusebius and Jerome into the Protestant Bible. Having achieved this goal, and having the satisfaction of seeing subsequent Revisions build upon those errors, it is only logical that in its own Bibles, Rome should eventually follow suit. This she has done at an appropriate time - shortly after the Vatican II Council (1962 to 1965) - in the form of the Jerusalem Bible. In this Bible we see the affinity between Rome and her brainchild, the Revised Version, and the similarity between it and the New International Version.

Both the JB and the NIV can be fairly described as interconfessional Bibles. Both made their debut following the ecumenical deliberations of the Vatican II Council. The translators of the NIV relied heavily on the United Bible Society's Greek New Testament in which there was Roman Catholic participation. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the Jerusalem Bible translators made use of the same UBS Greek text. Isn't this part of the scenario which Monsignor Alberto Ablondi has in mind when, in 1984, he saw the interconfessional Bibles as *"One of the most important*

advancements of post Vatican II ecumenism - and important step towards unity"?

Amazing! Isn't it? When Rome's Bibles failed to replace the Protestant's Bible, she imitated it. Then she tricked Protestants into adopting what she had once abandoned and then pretended to follow them! Rome can be facile, but she is never docile.

The scenario of current papal global strategy is boldly outlined by the Jesuit Dr Malachi Martin in his book, **"The Keys of This Blood"**. He speaks of a New World Order:

"Rooted in the moral laws of human behaviour revealed by God through the teaching of Christ, as proposed by Christ's Church" (p 19).

Which church? The church that for centuries sought to deprive the world of the written Word; the church which waged a relentless war against the custodians of the Word; the church which during the Protestant Reformation lost the **"Battle of the Bibles"**, and now has re-equipped its forces with interconfessional Bibles; the church that has inveigled Protestants into abandoning their Mighty Fortress thus allowing the enemy to undermine the very foundation of their existence!

Does this mean the **"Battle of the Bibles"** is over? Not at all!

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isaiah 40:8).

Chapter Twenty-Eight

Conclusion

"What is truth?" exclaimed Pontius Pilate and then assuaged his ruffled conscience with the symbolic act of hand washing.

Since then, the history of Christianity has been a record of the struggle of Christ's followers who heeded and lived the prayer of their Master to His heavenly Father on their behalf *"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth"*. (John 17:17).

Mountain fastnesses, catacombs, dungeon walls, the rack, gibbet and fiery stake have borne witness to the fidelity of God's people who *"Loved not their lives unto the death"* (Revelation 12:11). Thus was preserved for future generations the Word of God which sets men free.

It is all too easy and enticingly convenient for us whose liberty has been bought with the blood of the martyrs, to forget Rome's traditional hatred of God's living Word. We are all too inclined to indulge our wishful thinking, that such abhorrent behaviour was confined to the Dark Ages. On the contrary, within the lifetime of many who read this book, the sacrilege of Bible burning was still part of Rome's repertoire.

The September 13, 1913 London **"Protestant Observer"** published a report by Alfred Parcelli who recorded forty-three instances of Bible burning by Roman Catholics between the years 1851 and 1913 inclusive. (Source the SDA **"Protestant Magazine"**, June 1915).

Again, in the same issue we read of Rome's activities in that papal stronghold, the Philippine Islands, where in 1914, *"The burning of a large number of Bibles took place in Vegan, Ilocus Sur"* (ibid p 44).

No wonder that amidst the present day prosperity enjoyed by South East Asian countries, the Philippines are distinguished by impoverishment akin to that found in the Latin countries of Central and South America!

Presumably, it was the futility of coping with the output of modern printing presses that eventually convinced Rome that a planned program of Bible corruption would be more productive. The growing complacency of Protestants would allow such a program to succeed. Even "the truly Protestant" church sent a favourable signal to Rome - the particular issue of the "**Protestant Magazine**", from which the above quotation is taken, proved to be its swan song. It just disappeared!

Creeping compromise, a growing characteristic of slothful beneficiaries of the Reformation, once allowed to pupate in a cocoon of "respectability", will finally emerge as a creature of "acceptability". So while Protestant institutions and their values quietly fade away, Rome, ever watchful, seizes every vantage point to strengthen her ramparts.

The development of such a scenario will inevitably tempt Rome to superintend a return to the Dark Ages. But this time there would be an important difference. In the words of the late Sir Winston Churchill they would return on the "*The gleaming wings of science*". Churchill thus gave expression to a nagging fear engendered by the suppressed knowledge that Adolph Hitler was a Vatican lackey. He, along with Benito Mussolini had entered into a Concordat with the Vatican in return for "*a guarantee of political stability underwritten by the 'Vicar of Christ'*" (See "**The Inquisitive Christians**", pp 89-92).

Now, both dictators would help carry out the Vatican's plans to finally crush Britain. The country that more than any was responsible for the spread of the Protestant Bible and became the bastion of Protestantism, the power that freed the English-speaking world from the yoke of the pope, would now be irreversibly humbled and the defeat of the papal-sponsored Spanish Amarda avenged. Mussolini would restore the Holy Roman Empire, while Hitler's thousand year Reich would, in reality, be the pope's Millennium!

But, as history has once again testified, man's plans are as nothing if they are in conflict with God's divine program. The elements which once decided the fate of the Spanish Armada, now provided a protective cover for Britain's beleaguered armies. The very darkness of her hour of extremity only served to highlight the miracle of deliverance.

Once again, Rome was forced to turn to her weapons of political and spiritual subversion. The chief strategy in the new war would come to be known as "Ecumenism", while its chief weapon for the destruction of Protestantism would be the interconfessional Bibles.

We have seen how Rome's plan has been put into practice through the Vatican II Council and the interconfessional Bibles to which it gave birth. Gladly did the Protestant churches play the role of mid-wives and their offspring - the Bible Societies - as nursemaids to the re-born children of Eusebius and Origen.

So, once more, as in the days of Constantine, Rome has a Bible in place with which she hopes to reunite church and state, thereby obtaining global supremacy. Such a goal is by no means unattainable; rather, in the light of history and humanly speaking, it is a probability. This great counterfeit Christianity knows only too well that if she can destroy or neutralise the Bible which brought on and sustained the Protestant Reformation, then it is logical that Protestantism will crumble or, at the very least remain impotent.

Over and over again we hear the cry from professing Protestants that the language of the King James Version is so archaic that it can no longer be understood; therefore, by implication at least, we need the modern versions. In the opinion of the writer, this is nothing more than a red herring, and a very smelly one at that!

We have seen how proponents of the Revised Version (1881) used this excuse to "revise" the KJV and on these grounds also, the Southern Convocation of the Church of England gave permission for that revision. But we have also seen how Westcott and Hort, acting under the guidance of Cardinals Wiseman and Newman, used this occasion as a ploy to bring

out a new Catholic Bible. The same ploy is still being successfully used today. In offering this excuse, the publishers of some modern versions are serving up a gross insult to the mentality of our generation. Suddenly, our young people appear intellectually inferior to their parents and grandparents! Yet we do not hear demands for Shakespear's works to be revised. Of course not; their artistry would surely be lost!

Over the last one hundred years we have had about as many Bible versions - all claiming to improve on the inadequacies of their predecessors. Presumably, there will be no end to this chicanery so long a gullible buyers are around to keep cash registers ringing.

The author has lived for a considerable time in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and the Fiji Islands. In his experience, the indigenous people of these countries evidenced no problems in understanding God's Word in the commonly used KJV. And this - in spite of the fact that, to these people, English is a foreign language!. Are these people intellectually superior to those of us living in Australia or New Zealand? Yet this is what such specious arguments would imply! It would be much nearer the truth to suggest that young people who have been exposed to the barrage of modern versions have come to lose confidence in God's Word because of all the meddling to which it has been subjected. Hence they do not have the thirst for a knowledge of God's will for man that our less privileged brothers have in what we are pleased to call "developing countries".

We have every reason to appropriate to those publishers who offer this argument as an excuse for their versions, this following statement concerning the revisers of 1881 and 1901:

"The Revisers had a wonderful opportunity. They might have made a few changes and removed a few archaic expressions, and made the Authorised Version the most acceptable and beautiful and wonderful book of all time to come. But they wished ruthlessly to meddle. Some of them wanted to change doctrine. Some of them did not know good English literature when they saw it

There were enough modernists among the Revisers to change the words of Scripture itself so as to throw doubt on the Scripture" ("Herald and Presbyter" [Presbyterian], July 16, 1924, p 10).

Another specious claim made by modern revisers is that the translators of today have access to better manuscripts than those which were available to the KJV translators. Among the modern scholars who explode this myth is Theodore P. Letis. After methodically presenting both sides of the argument he concludes that:

"Since the great advance in manuscript evidence has only amplified with greater numerical preponderance that text-type deliberately chosen by Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza, they would chose no differently today in any major respects" ("The Majority Text: Essays and Reviews in the Continuing Debate" 1987, pp 139, 140).

Could we suggest to our readers that, when offered this red herring, they counter by asking a simple question: "Which manuscripts?"

We have already acquainted ourselves with the so-called better manuscripts on which most modern versions are based, They are held to be none other than the survivors of Constantine's Origen-impregnated Bible, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

We could further embarrass our proponents of Rome's tainted Bibles by asking why the KJV was allowed to reign for over two and a half centuries unchallenged by Protestantism until, in 1870, these two survivors of Constantine's Bible were suddenly exalted to a place of dictatorship in the work of revision? Says Dean Burgon:

"These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence ... [they] are, demonstrably, nothing else but specimens of the depraved class thus characterised" ("Revision Revised", pp 315, 317).

Yet another question is pertinent. Why does the tide of modern revision flow relentlessly Romeward?

An appropriate answer is to be found in the Protestant New Brunswick review of August, 1954, which has turned out to be quite prophetic. Speaking of that traitor to the Church of England, Cardinal Newman who along with his co-traitor, Cardinal Wiseman, engineered the fraud of revision, we read:

"He had left the leprosy of Popery cleaving to the very walls of Oxford, to infect the youth of England through an unknown future" (p 322).

And then, speaking of Dr Schaff, the American reviser, and his apostate position adopted in his "History of the Apostolic Church":

"The positions he has already advanced, are such as to lay the whole truth and grace of God, and the whole liberty, hope, and salvation of the human race, at the feet of the Roman Papacy" (ibid p 325).

It is this phenomenon that caused Wilkinson to observe:

"This so-called Bible revision has become one of the deadliest of weapons in the hands of those who glorify the Dark Ages and who seek to bring Western nations back to the theological thinking which prevailed before the Reformation" ("Or Authorised Bible Vindicated", p 103).

No wonder Cardinal Wiseman exulted over the way Rome had used Protestants to insinuate the Catholic Vulgate into their very own Bible!

Now that we have a clear insight into Rome's grand plan for the subversion of Protestantism, there is no need to consent with awesome wonderment to the learned scholars who tritely refer to the "original Greek text" in order to substantiate Bible renderings which are in conflict with the Received Text. Rather, we should ask them to identify their Greek text. Do not be surprised if they should reveal their ignorance of the fact

that there have been two streams of New Testament texts throughout the history of post-apostolic Christendom - the uncorrupted Word of God and the philosophical corruptions of man. Do not be surprised if they have never heard of Dr Burgon and his devastating exposure of the fraud of revision. His "**Revision Revised**", is a monumental work which modern textual critics prefer to ignore rather than expose their ignorance while making a futile attempt to gainsay it. The mere mention of this book in the schools of Babylon would be to risk giving the show away.

And, lastly, would the proponents of Rome's interconfessional Bibles, please explain why, in an age of such a plethora of "better Bible versions", Christianity, generally has steadily been losing ground, while Protestantism, that generator of Western civilisation, has become a spent force! Does this give us a clue as to why Western society is itself in serious decline?

The issue is clear. If we accept the Bibles that contain Rome's input, then we are acknowledging Rome's claim that she has ever been the custodian of God's Holy Word. In that case, we must accept her as God's favoured true church. Therefore, the Reformation was a great mistake and we should all welcome back the Dark Ages.

On the other hand, if we accept the Bibles preserved from apostolic times by such people as the Waldenses and the Albigenses as handed on to the Reformers, then we must re-affirm the Protestant stand on God's Word alone and reject the apostles of ecumenism and their interconfessional Bibles.

Alphabetical Index

(Note: Pages 165 to 184 containing comparisons of Bible Versions texts are not indexed).

A.

Abbott, Ezra, Dr, Unitarian	118
Ablondi, Alberto	138,188
Aidan	82
Albigenses	196
Alexander VI, Pope	16
Allegorising	70,72,77,95
Allen Wm. Cardinal	43,46-48,52, 58,62
Allix, Historian	105
Alva, Duke	46
Antioch Bibles	74,75,105
Apocrypha	20,76,94,120,121, 135,152
Appel, Dr	116
Armada, Spanish	53,54,57-59,192
Armada, pope's involvement	53, 54
Arundel, Archbishop	12
Arundel, Constitution of	12
Augustine	86,186
Aurelian, Roman Emperor	75
"Australasian Record",	158,159
Auxentius, Bishop of Milan	85

B

Babington plot	51,52
Bacon	62
Baptist Church	127
Ballard, John	51
Barnabas, apostle	74
"Beast" of Revelation	90
Benigno, Franciscan priest	98
Bible burning	28,190
Bible Society, American	119,123, 124,135
Bible Society in Australia	122,132, 137
Bible Society, British and Foreign	

	119-122,132,135,138,152
Bible Society NSW	122,132,134
Bible Society New York	119
Bible Society Trinitarian	121,122, 133-135,139,140,160
Bible Society United (UBS)	134, 135,138,139,147,152,160,188
Bombasius, Paul, Professor of Greek	19
Bonner, Bishop	33,35
Borgia, Caesar	16
Bradford, Reformer	31
Bull, papal	44
Burton, Dean, Dr	109,111-113, 122,125,127,194,196

C

Calvin, John, Reformer	40
Campion, Jesuit	44,45
Catherine of Aragon	31
Charles V, Spanish Emperor	32,33
Christchurch, NZ (memorial to martyrs)	34
Churchill, Winston	191
Clement of Alexandria	71,72
Clement, Pope	8
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor	101,102
Colet, John	16,17,20,27
Columba	82,83
Columbanus	82
Comba	84,85
Constantine, Emperor	77,78,84, 86,104,105,185,192,194
Congregation of the Index	98
Council of Churches	134
Council of Trent	20,40-43,50,68, 85,94,124,129,133,147,156,157
Coverdale, Miles, translator	30,31
Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop	30,

D

- Damasus, Pope 78
 "Daniel", thesis 158
 Dark Ages 13,27,40,65,66,78,87,
 89,146,186,190,191,195,196
 Dead, state of 148
 Diocletian, Roman Emperor 77
 Diatessaron, (four in one) 71
 Dominic, Passionist priest 96
 Dominicans, order of monks 14,56
 Douay College 43,48,62,90

E

- Edward III, King 10
 Edward VI, King 31
 Elizabeth I, Queen 37,38,43-48,51,
 52,57,61
 Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester 105-
 109,117,164,184
 Erasmus, Desiderius 15-23,25-27,
 29,30,73,103,104,106,114,126,
 187,194
 Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea 68,
 73,76,78,79,87,185
 Eusebius's Greek Bible 85,111,
 104,173,185-188,192

F

- Faber, Dr 64,97
 Federal Council of Churches 149
 Fesdick, H.E. 148
 Frances Xavier, Jesuit 56
 Francis II, King 38
 Franciscans, R.C. Order 98,110
 French Revolution 90
 Froben, printer 20
 Froude, Herrell 93-95
 Fulke, Dr, (Jesuit) 186
 Full Gospel Business Men, 157
 Fuller, Otis, Editor 143-145

G

- Geneva Bible 40
 Gnosticism 69,70,72,76,173,173
 Goa, India 54,56
 Gore, Bishop 109
 Great Bible 30,34
 Gregory IX, Pope 14
 Gregory XIII, Pope 47,52
 Gutenberg, Johannes, inventor of
 printing 13

H

- Helvidius 85
 Henry IV, King 12
 Henry VIII, King 19,27,30,31,54
 Hills, E.F. Thd. 79,143
 Hitler, Adolph 191
 Hort, F.J.A. Dr 90,97,100-105,
 107-109,111,113,117,144,185,192
 Howard, Lord 59
 Humanists 15,20,21
 Hunter, Wm. martyr 34,35

I

- Interconfessional Bibles 133,135,
 137,139,160,188,192,196
 Index, Congregation of 98
 India, Syriac Bible 87
 Inquisition 14,32,34,46,55,56
 "Inquisitive Christians, the" 56,87,
 191
 Iona, School of Columba 82
 Irenaeus 72
 Itala Bible 75,80,83-87,105,
 123,180,185-187

J

- James VI, of Scotland (later James
 I of England) 60,61
 Jerome 13,20,73,78-81,85,83,89,
 90,104,118,144,173,185,186,188
 Jesuit, Society of 41,43,46,50,

Jesuit Bible	44,49,52,62,90,107,186
John, apostle	68,71
Jones A.T. Relig. Lib. Advoc.	156
Jones E.S. preacher	149
Jovinianus	85,86

K

Kent, Earl of	51
King James translators	63
Knox, John, Reformer	38-40,52
Koine Greek	74,75

L

"Ladies Home Journal"	65
Lancaster, Duke	12
Lang, Andrew, historian	83
Latimer (martyr)	31,34
Leo X, Pope	19,21
Letis, Theodore P. scholar	194
Lightfoot, Dr	101,102,107,108
Lindanus, Bishop	186
Lollards	9,11,12
Lucian of Antioch	21,75,76,78, 80,83,186
Luther, Martin	15,23,26-28,41,46, 114,123,126
Lyola, Ignatius, (Jesuit)	41

M

Magan, P.T. Dr	156,157
Martini, Carlo, Bishop of Milan	139
Martin, Malachi, Dr (Jesuit)	189
Marcion, Gnostic	71
Martyr, Justin	71
Mary, (Bloody), Queen	31-33,35, 37,38
Mary, Stuart	38,46,51,52,54
Mary - worship	101
Matthews Bible	30,33
Maurice, Frederick (Unitarian)	101
Maxwell, A.G.	152
Maxwell, A.S. author	146-149
Medici, de, Cardinal, later Pope	
Leo X	19

Medina, Sidonia, Duke	57,59
Mercersburg theology	116
Methodist Church	127,155
Monasticism	85
Moulton, Dr Revisionist	106,107
Mussolini, Benito	191

N

Napoleon, Bonaparte	90
National Council of Churches	135, 148,149,154,158
Nestle, Greek N.T.	114
Newman, John, Cardinal	73,86,91- 98,100,102,103,105,107,110,116, 118,187,188,192,195
New International Version	114,132, 139,161,162,188
Nolan, historian,	23,25,76

O

Olivetian, (Waldensian)	40
Olivetian Bible	28
"Operation People's Bible"	28
Orchard, Bernard, priest	150
Origen	72,73,7-79,80,94, 118,173,192,194
Origenism	79,95,104,169
"Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"	127,143
Oxford Movement	91,92,94,105, 107,111,115,116

P

Pamphilus	78
"Paper Pope"	94,97
Parma, Duke	55,58
Parcelli, Alfred	190
Patrick of Ireland	81,82,84
Paul, apostle	69,74,75
Paul VI, Pope	135
Penance	49
Peshitta Bible	74-76,80,83,87,123
Peter's Pence	8

Peter, apostle 8,84,117
 Philip II of Spain 32,36,37,43,
 46-48,52-55,57-59
 Pius X, Pope 44,138
 Pole, Cardinal 33,37
 Presbyterian Church 124
 Protestant Paper 160
 "Protestant Magazine" 160,191
 Pucci, Cardinal 19
 Purgatory 97,99,114,130,183
 Pusey 91,96,107

R

Ray, J.J. author 114,143
 Reuchlin, John 14,15
 Revised Standard Version 114,132,
 134,147-151,154,158
 Rheims Bible 49,51,62,64,89,90,
 103,105,107,187
 Rheims College 48
 Ribera, Jesuit 158
 Ridley, 31,34
 Rivera, Alberto, (ex-Jesuit) 156-
 158,163
 "Revision Revised" (Burton) 196
 "Rock", Peter 117
 Rogers, John 30-35
 Rome, College 48

S

Sabbath (Saturday) 83,146
 Saunders, Protestant 31
 Saunders, Jesuit 44
 Schaff, Philip, Dr 116-118,195
 Scrivener, Dr 72,86,105,109,113,
 122,125
 Seventh-day Adventist General
 Conference 127,129,130,145,
 156,159
 Seventh-day Adventist Hymnal 161,
 162
 Seymour, Jane 31
 Shakespeare, Wm. 62
 Shapur I, Persian King 75

Simon, Richard 89
 Sinaiticus MS 104,105,109,110,
 114,140,146,185,187,194
 Sixtus V, Pope 52,53,57,59
 Smith, Miles, D.D. 63
 Smith, Vance, (Unitarian) 109
 Sowtree, Wm. (martyr) 12
 Stephens 73
 Stunica 73

T

Tait, Dr 98
 Tatian, 71,123
 "The Great Controversy Between
 Christ and Satan" 155,156
 "The King James Version
 Defended" 143
 "The New Revised Standard Vers-
 ion of the Bible", pamphlet 151
 "The Protestant Magazine" 153
 Tractarianism, 92,111
 "Truth Triumphant" 126,146
 Turks - invade Constantinople 13
 Tyndale, Wm. Translator 19,23,
 25-28,30,31,33,62,123,126,129,
 150,187

U

Unitarian, 101,109,118,121,122,140
 United Bible Societies 134,138,147
 United Bible Society's Greek N.T.
 139,188

V

Valla, Laurentius 18,22
 Vatican, 28,40,56,84,97,
 135-137,191
 Vatican II Council 134,139,147
 152,164,188,189,192
 Vaticanus, Codex 19,23,25,78,79,
 104,105,109,110,114,140,146,180,
 185,187,194
 Vaughan, Cardinal 133
 Vulgate, (Italia) 80,83

Vulgate (Latin R.C.) 11,14,19,22,
26,41-43,48-50,79,83,85,90,94,98,
100,103,130,144,185-188,195
Victoria, Queen 105

W

Waldenses 13,25,29,84,86,87,96,
196
Waldensian Bibles 26,29,40,41,66,
85,86,87,105,120,144,185,187
Waldo, Peter 84
Walsingham, 51
Ward, biographer, 97,99
Weigle, Luther, Dr 151
Westcott 90,97,100-109,111,113,
114,117,140,144,185,187,188,192
Westcott and Hort Greek N.T. 103,
105,107,114
"Which Bible" 143
Whitchurch 31
White, E.G. author 146,155
Whitty, Dr, Jesuit 98

Wilkinson, B.G. author 23,62,63,
69,72,76,77,79,81-84,94,95,99,
106,125-129,143-146,151,195
Wilkinson, R.F. Dr 151
Wilberforce, Samuel, Bishop 106-
109

Wiseman, Nicholas, P.S. Cardinal
91,97-100,102,110,111,187,188,
192,195
Wordsworth, Bishop 113
World Council of Churches 134,
147,150
World Catholic Federation for
Biblical Apostolate 136,137
Wyatt, Sir Thomas 32
Wycliffe, John 9,-13,16,19,24,26

X

Xavier, Francis, (Jesuit) 56

Y

"Your Bible and You" 146,149

Chronological Index

A.D.	Page
70. Destruction of Jerusalem	74
100. Death of apostle John	68,71
150. Peshitta Bible	75
157. Itala Bible	75,86
312. Lucian of Antioch martyred	76
313. Constantine's conversion to Christianity	77
331. Supposed date of Sinaitic and Vaticanus Manuscripts	105
360. Birth of Patrick	81
382. Jerome's Vulgate	77,78
390. (circa) Patrick returns to Ireland	82
476 - 1453 Dark Ages	
1233. Gregory IX appoints Dominican's in charge of Inquisition	14
1324. Birth of John Wycliffe	9
1380. Wycliffe, John, completes English Bible	11
1390. English Upper House moves to ban Wycliffe's N.T.	12
1401. Sowtree, Wm. martyred at Smithfield	12
1440. Printing invented in Mainz	13,27
1467 (-1536) Erasmus born	15
1483 (-1546) Luther born	15
1505. Erasmus edits annotations of Valla	18
1507. Erasmus visits Rome	19
1510 - 1514 Erasmus lectures at Oxford	16,25
1516. Erasmus publishes his Greek N.T.	21
1522. Luther's German N.T. published	27
1524. Tyndale flees to Germany	27
1525. Tyndale publishes his English N.T.	28
1530. Tyndale's N.T. burnt in England	28
1534. English Parliament abrogates papal supremacy	27
1535. Coverdale's Bible	30
1536. Tyndale martyred	28
1537. Matthews English Bible published	30
1537. Olivetan French Bible published	28
1539. The Great Bible	30
1545 - 1563 Council of Trent	40-43
1547. Henry VIII dies	31
1553. Edward VI dies	31
1555. John Rogers martyred	33
1555. Wm. Hunter martyred	34
1560. Geneva Bible published	40
1560. Goa (Indian) Inquisition established	56
1562. Douay College established by Philip II	43
1581. Portugal annexed by Spain	47

A.D.	Page
1582. Rheims (Jesuit) English N.T. published	49
1586. Babington Conspiracy	50,51
1588. Spanish Armada sails	57
1603. James VI of Scotland becomes James I of England	60
1611. Authorised Bible of King James published	64
1804. British and Foreign Bible Society founded	119
1809. New York Bible Society founded	119
1816. American Bible Society founded	119
1817. British and Foreign Bible Society enters Australia	122
1831. Trinitarian Bible Society founded	121
1833. Oxford (Tractarian) Movement founded	94
1844. Philip Schaff arrives in USA	116
1850. Wiseman made a Cardinal	99
1859. Sinaiticus MS (Aleph) rediscovered in Sinai	104
1870. KJV Revision Body appointed	107
1881. Revised N.T. published	111,122
1883. Burgon's "Revision Revised" published	113
1901. British and Foreign Bible Society agree to distribute RV	122
1930. Wilkinson publishes "Our Authorised Bible Vindicated"	127
1930. General Conference of SDA reject Wilkinson's book	127
1944. Wilkinson's, book "Truth Triumphant" published	126
1946. United Bible Society formed	134
1950. American Bible Society associates with National Council of Churches	135
1952. Revised Standard Version published	134
1962 - 1965 Vatican Council II	134
1966. United Bible Society agrees to circulate Apocrypha	135
1971. Jerusalem Bible published	135
1973. New International Version published	132
1984. Bible Societies liberalise constitution to include all Christian faiths	139

THE AIMS OF THE TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY

- * To publish and distribute the Holy Scriptures throughout the world in many languages.
- * To promote Bible translations which are accurate and trustworthy.
- * To bring light and life, through the Gospel of Christ, to those who are lost in sin and in the darkness of false religion and unbelief.
- * To uphold the doctrines of reformed Christianity, bearing witness to the equal and eternal deity of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, three Persons in One God.
- * To uphold the Bible as the inspired, inerrant Word of God.

FOR THE GLORY OF GOD AND THE INCREASE OF HIS KINGDOM

For introductory literature and catalogues please write to the Society.

**TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY
217 KINGSTON ROAD, LONDON, SW19 3NN
ENGLAND**

This advertisement is gladly given in gratitude to the Society and for the convenience of those who appreciate its work.

It should not be construed to think that the T.B.S. had any involvement whatsoever in the publication of this book. - (*Publisher*).

ADDRESSES FOR FURTHER INFORMATION***Headquarters:***

Trinitarian Bible Society
217 Kingston Road
London SW19 3NN
England

Canada:

Trinitarian Bible Society (Canada)
39 Caldwell Crescent
Brampton
Ontario L6W 1A2
Canada

U.S.A.:

Trinitarian Bible Society (U.S.A.)
1710 Richmond Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids
MI 49504 U.S.A.

Australia:

Trinitarian Bible Society (Australia)
4 Islington Street
Mt Pleasant NSW 2749
Australia

New Zealand:

Trinitarian Bible Society (New Zealand)
273 St. Heliers Bay Road
St. Heliers
Auckland 5
New Zealand

"The Inquisitive Christians"

By H.H. Meyers

While recently researching in Indian and Sri Lankan libraries in connection with this book, **"Battle of the Bibles"**, the author was aware that the Syriac Bibles which had been used for well over a millennium by the St Thomas Christians have all been destroyed, save one, which is now in England.

This wanton act by the Portuguese was accompanied by the destruction of the liturgy of the Indian Eastern Orthodox Christians. Such a calamity was brought about through threats of arrest by the Inquisitors of Goa.

Set up in 1560, at the behest of the Jesuit missionary, Francis Xavier, the Goa Inquisition continued to reinforce the zeal of papal missionaries until the British forced its closure early in the nineteenth century. Today, no traces of its infamous dungeons remain, and all official records of the Inquisition have disappeared.

Few people today, even in India, are aware that the Goa Inquisition even existed! The author was shocked to find that Christian libraries in India abound in books which ignore, downplay and falsify the facts of India's Inquisition. Sensing an example of one of Rome's deliberate cover-ups, he realised that here was a wealth of material much of which is outside the scope of **"Battle of the Bibles"**. Accordingly, he availed himself of the fast disappearing sources of information left to us by contemporaries of the Inquisition, to write **"The Inquisitive Christians"**.

Among the sources used in documenting this dreadful account of India's introduction to Imperial Christianity are Portuguese, English and Indian historians, and the personal account of a Frenchman whose incarceration in Goa preceded his sentencing to the Portuguese galleys.